

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1902.

No. 2.

---

## Doctrinal Theology.

---

### ESCHATOLOGY.

Eschatology is the doctrine of holy Scripture concerning temporal death and the intermediate state of departed souls, the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, final judgment, the consummation of all things, the everlasting damnation of the wicked, and the eternal bliss of the righteous in the world to come. Concerning all these things God has, in his word, revealed whatever he would have us know concerning them, and while, also in this respect, *whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning*,<sup>1)</sup> the words of the apostle, *Behold, I show you a mystery*,<sup>2)</sup> with which he sets forth one particular point of these *ἔσχατα*, apply to all of them. Here, too, *we know in part, and we prophesy in part*,<sup>3)</sup> and with the psalmist we say, *My soul doth wait, and in his word do I hope*.<sup>4)</sup> The last things, being mostly, in their nature, future events, are, as such, objects of Christian hope, and inasmuch as Christian hope is essentially faith concerning things to come, it must be in all its points based upon the

---

1) Rom. 15, 4.

3) 1 Cor. 13, 9.

2) 1 Cor. 15, 51.

4) Ps. 130, 5.

written word of God. In Eschatology, as elsewhere in theology, whatever goes beyond the explicit statements of Scripture is not theology, but wild speculation, not Christian hope or faith, but idle dreams.

#### A. TEMPORAL DEATH.

Death is a mysterious thing. It is not merely and simply lifelessness. A stone, though void of life, is not properly dead. Death, as a process, is the cessation or extinction of life, which superinduces the state of death, the extinctness of life in a subject which was previously a living being. But life itself is an inscrutable mystery. Biology, the science of life or living things, while it has discovered and followed up many of the various manifestations of life, is utterly and hopelessly in the dark concerning the nature of that peculiar spontaneity which we call life, with the extinction of which all the manifold and various exertions and activities of which it is the principle come to an end, and which, when it has once become extinct, can never be restored by any natural cause or by any amount of human ingenuity or skill. Materialism is but an emphatic acknowledgment of the persistent futility and utter hopelessness of all the endeavors of the human mind to fathom this hidden mystery. Reducing the phenomena of life to chemical action, these scientists, or rather, nescients, simply deny what they cannot solve, and of which their very denial is but another evidence. But there is probably an ethical interest at the bottom of this denial. For the denial of life is also a denial of death. It is the same subtle foolishness of wickedness which denies God, soul, sin, life, and death.

Life in the created universe is of various orders, vegetable, animal, human and angelic life, and a subject can be dead only in the sense in which it was previously alive, as it can be deprived of such life only as it had. But vegetable and animal life and death do not concern us here; it

is human life and death wherewith we have to deal in this chapter of theology.

Man was not made to die. When God made man, he made him *a living soul*,<sup>1)</sup> and it was not with a view of undoing his work that he made man what he made him. Man was made for life, for immortality, being endowed with a *posse non mori*, which was to give place to a *non posse mori*. This living being was made up of two distinct constituent parts, a material body, *formed of the dust of the ground*,<sup>2)</sup> and elsewhere simply called *the dust*,<sup>3)</sup> and an immaterial soul, which was not made into separate existence and afterwards united with the body, but created into the body by the breath of God, who *breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*.<sup>4)</sup> By this breath or spirit of life what had before been a perfect human body, not a dead body, but a lifeless body, was quickened, and thus the whole human being, a complete person, was a living soul, named after its *pars potior*, that part wherein the personality and the life of the whole living person immediately inhered. By this personal union in a physical unit the life of the soul or spirit of man was also the life of the body as of a living organism, exerting its various energies in manifold manifestations of life by and through the several organs and avenues provided by the Creator when he formed the body for the purposes for which it was intended. This intimate union of body and soul, having been established by a creative act of God, was not intended as temporary and transient, but as permanent. Yet this union contemplated in the plan of creation was not, like the personal union between the divine nature of the Son of God with a human nature decreed in the plan of redemption, absolutely inseparable, but such that, under changed conditions, what God had joined together might, by a special dispensation of God, be again put asunder. And these changed con-

---

1) Gen. 2, 7.

2) Ibid.

3) Eccl. 12, 7.

4) Gen. 2, 7.



ditions actually came about. They were not brought about by the Creator, but by the will of man under the influence of Satan. Sin entered into the world, *and death by sin.*<sup>1)</sup> And the special dispensation of God whereby death was made the consequence and penalty of sin was set forth in the word, *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*<sup>2)</sup> Accordingly, man, who, in his primeval state, had been a living soul in the full sense of the word, was, in his fallen state, consigned to death in the full compass of the term. Sin entered in and separated between man and God. This was the beginning of death, which set in on the day when the first human sin was committed. But sin was not in the world at large, like a miasma in the air; it was not only on record against man with the judgment pronounced thereon and the penalty imposed; it *dwelled in* man,<sup>3)</sup> and dwelling in every individual sinner, *worked death,*<sup>4)</sup> a separation of body and soul. Like a keen wedge, either working its way as by its own gravity from infancy to decrepit old age, or accelerated in its progress by actual sins, as of unchastity or intemperance, or by intermediate consequences of sin, as disease and want, or driven home by one finishing blow, as by an assassin's hand or a thunderbolt, sin forces asunder, under divine dispensation, what God has joined together. This disruption of body and soul, under now prevailing conditions, comes about in the course of nature, or by natural causes. But it is only in his fallen nature that it is natural for man to die. Death, like sin, was not created into the world. Hence the pang we feel in the face of death, be it our own or that of others, even where death has lost its sting. For the separation of body and soul is death to the body, the end of its physical life. The body has no life of its own aside from that of the soul, the spirit of life. When the soul *departs,*<sup>5)</sup> taking its flight from

---

1) Rom. 5, 12.

2) Gen. 2, 17.

3) Rom. 7, 17. 20.

4) Rom. 7, 13.

5) 2 Tim. 4, 6. Phil. 1, 23.

its earthly house of this tabernacle,<sup>1)</sup> whether carried into Abraham's bosom,<sup>2)</sup> or hurried away to hell and torments,<sup>3)</sup> it takes with it the life inherent in it and leaves the body not only lifeless, but dead, deprived of the life by which its various functions were actuated and sustained. Thus it is that the dead body falls a prey to *corruption*,<sup>4)</sup> for which it was not originally intended, and *the dust returns to the earth as it was*.<sup>5)</sup> Such is death, a consequence of sin, not a natural consequence, not a fruit growing from an evil tree according to a preestablished law of nature, or a product of the evolution of evil in man, but a consequence of sin ordained by a *voluntas consequens* in God. Such is the physical death of sinful mortals everywhere, as the psalmist says, *Thou turnest man to destruction. . . . Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as a sleep: in the morning they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth. . . . For it is soon cut off, and we fly away*.<sup>6)</sup>

And yet there is a vast difference between the temporal death of one class of men and that of another, the death of the wicked and the death of God's elect. When death was ordained because of sin, it was in the mind of God not only as a consequence, but also as a penalty of sin. *The wages of sin is death*,<sup>7)</sup> and wages are meted out for and in consideration of that whereby they are earned. Death is the penalty of sin imposed by the judicial justice and executed by the punitive or retributive justice of God, according to which *the soul that sinneth, it shall die*.<sup>8)</sup> Not only in consequence of, but *FOR his iniquity that he hath done shall he die*.<sup>9)</sup> That this judgment includes, though it is not restricted to, the physical death of the sinner, is clear beyond the possibility of doubt by the fact that man's Substitute,

1) 2 Cor. 5, 1.

2) Luke 16, 22.

3) Luke 16, 23.

4) 2 Cor. 4, 16. 1 Cor. 15, 42.

5) Eccl. 12, 7.

6) Ps. 90, 3 — 5. 10.

7) Rom. 6, 23.

8) Ezek. 18, 20.

9) Ezek. 18, 26; cf. 33, 18.



the Holy One, being *made under the law*,<sup>1)</sup> and *made to be sin for us*,<sup>2)</sup> was also made to suffer the penalty of sin demanded by the law, *death, even the death of the cross*,<sup>3)</sup> death, which could not come upon him as a consequence of sin, since *in him is no sin*.<sup>4)</sup> It was not possible that Christ should die of a lingering disease. He died a judicial death, sentenced by an unjust judge, Pontius Pilate, but also sentenced by a righteous Judge, the Lord of hosts, who had *laid upon him the iniquity of us all*.<sup>5)</sup> When he was *cut off out of the land of the living*, he was *stricken for the transgression of his people*,<sup>6)</sup> being *wounded for our transgressions*, and *bruised for our iniquities*.<sup>7)</sup> When he *poured out his soul unto death*, it was because he was *numbered with the transgressors* and *bore the sin of many*.<sup>8)</sup> And now, since our Substitute stood condemned and sentenced and the sentence of temporal and eternal death was executed when he was forsaken of God in his agony and died the death of the cross, there is no condemnation, no sentence, no penalty, either temporal or eternal, to them which are in Christ Jesus.<sup>9)</sup> But there are those who reject the vicarious sacrifice of the Mediator, denying the Lord that bought them, and thus *bringing upon themselves swift destruction*,<sup>10)</sup> temporal and eternal death as the just penalty of their sins. *When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby*.<sup>11)</sup> When the soul of the unbeliever is required of him,<sup>12)</sup> it is a guilt-laden soul, under the wrath of God, a soul *already condemned* because of its unbelief.<sup>13)</sup> This condemnation is again unto death, eternal death, and the wicked soul is, in the moment of death, when it is torn from its habitation of clay, hurried to the prison-house of condemned spirits, down

1) Gal. 4, 4.

2) 2 Cor. 5, 21.

3) Rom. 5, 10. Phil. 2, 8. Luke 23, 46.

4) 1 John 3, 5; cf. 2 Cor. 5, 21. John 8, 46.

5) Is. 53, 6.

6) Is. 53, 8.

7) Is. 53, 5.

8) Is. 53, 12.

9) Rom. 8, 1.

10) 2 Pet. 2, 1.

11) Ezek. 33, 18.

12) Luke 12, 20.

13) John 3, 18.

to hell, where also the angels that sinned are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.<sup>1)</sup> It is there that the souls of the unbelievers of the days of Noah were led more fully to comprehend that their condemnation was well-merited, when he, by faith in whom Noah, the preacher of righteousness, was saved, appeared in hell after his quickening in the sepulchre and heralded his victory over Satan, sin, and death, in his arch-enemy's dungeon.<sup>2)</sup> This is *הַאֵשׁ*, *ḡēhēs*, *hell*, whither the souls of the ungodly are sent, not to annihilation, but to destruction, *everlasting destruction*, whereby *they who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ shall be punished*.<sup>3)</sup> *The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God*.<sup>4)</sup> *The wicked in a moment go down to hell*.<sup>5)</sup> And hell is to the wicked soul in a certain sense what the grave is to the body, a place of perdition. Hence hell and destruction are conjoined in such texts as these: *Hell and destruction are before the Lord*; <sup>6)</sup> *Hell is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering*.<sup>7)</sup> That *הַאֵשׁ* sometimes also stands for *grave*<sup>8)</sup> is only consistent with the various *usus loquendi* of *death*, which likewise stands for physical *death*, which kills the body and consigns it to destruction in the grave, and for spiritual and eternal *death*, the destruction of the soul and, finally, of both soul and body, in hell.<sup>9)</sup> And hell is not a haven of rest after the storms of life; neither is it a purgatory for smelting out the dross of sinfulness; nor is it an underworld like fabled Tartarus, where the souls of the good and the evil bewail their cold and gloomy existence: but it is a prison, unapproachably separated from the abode of the blessed, a place of punishment, where the souls of the wicked are confined

1) 2 Pet. 2, 4. Jude 6.

2) 1 Pet. 3, 18—20.

3) 2 Thess. 1, 8. 9.

4) Ps. 9, 17.

5) Job 21, 13.

6) Prov. 15, 11.

7) Job 26, 6; cf. Prov. 27, 20.

8) Gen. 37, 35; 44, 31. 1 Sam. 2, 6. Ps. 6, 5 al.

9) Matt. 10, 28.



with the devil and his angels, being in torments, and without a ray of hope for final delivery. *When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish, and the hope of unjust men perisheth.*<sup>1)</sup> Being dead in sin and under the wrath, the wicked soul, in physical death, sinks away into eternal death, in which it will be joined by the body on the day of judgment. Such is the course of death.

The course of life leads in an opposite direction, though also through the valley of temporal death. The death of the righteous is, like the death of the wicked, a separation of body and soul. Paul speaks of his impending death as his *departure*,<sup>2)</sup> the dissolution of this tabernacle;<sup>3)</sup> for him to die is to be unclothed.<sup>4)</sup> The souls of the righteous leave their habitations of clay, lay aside their garments of corruptible material, and depart. This is a consequence of sin. *Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.*<sup>5)</sup> Also when Christians die, *the body is dead because of sin.*<sup>6)</sup> God has ordained it so, and so must it be. Like disease and want and other hardships of our earthly pilgrimage, death has its pang and pain for those also whose Shepherd is the Lord. Paul would have preferred to be spared this bitter cup and *to be clothed upon* rather than *unclothed*,<sup>7)</sup> that mortality might not fall a prey to death, but *be swallowed up of life.*<sup>8)</sup> Yet, on the other hand, he also longs to be delivered from this body of sin and death,<sup>9)</sup> knowing that *he that is dead is freed from sin.*<sup>10)</sup> The termination of this mortal life in consequence of sin is also a termination of this sinful life, a cessation from sinning. Thus the final putting off of the old man with his sins and evil lusts also terminates the ceaseless struggle between the flesh and the spirit,<sup>11)</sup> and frees us from the burden under which we groan

1) Prov. 11, 7; cf. Eccl. 11, 3.

2) 2 Tim. 4, 6; cf. Phil. 1, 23.

3) 2 Cor. 5, 1.

4) 2 Cor. 5, 4.

5) Rom. 5, 12.

6) Rom. 8, 10.

7) 2 Cor. 5, 4.

8) Ibid.

9) Rom. 6, 6; 7, 24.

10) Rom. 6, 7.

11) Gal. 5, 17. Rom. 7, 11. 25.



while we are in this tabernacle.<sup>1)</sup> *We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.*<sup>2)</sup> In regeneration we were quickened into spiritual life, and in sanctification we walk in newness of life. But as we run our course, we are hindered by *sin which doth so easily beset us.*<sup>3)</sup> In death we *lay aside every weight,*<sup>4)</sup> and the spirit is set free, having *fought a good fight*<sup>5)</sup> and carried off the final victory. Thus the Christian, according to that nature which predominates in him and gives him his character, is not a loser but a gainer<sup>6)</sup> by the event which to the unbeliever is loss in every way. Natural man is dead in sin, and passes through physical death into a lower stage of misery, a confirmed state of spiritual death according to the soul, which is not set free, but sent to a prison of condemned spirits. But the regenerate man has *passed from death unto life,*<sup>7)</sup> and *hath everlasting life.*<sup>8)</sup> This life of faith and hope is not subdued in physical death, but is carried forward and upward to a higher mode or form of existence, the soul being transferred to a state of confirmed spiritual life with Christ in glory and perfect bliss for ever. Thus the physical death of a Christian is the very reverse of the death of the worldling, not a sinking away into deeper death, but a rising into higher life. On the day of his death the robber's ransomed soul was with Christ in paradise.<sup>9)</sup> Not in Sheol, a common abode of all departed souls both good and evil, but in *paradise*; and paradise is *heaven*, even *the third heaven.*<sup>10)</sup> *To be absent from the body* is, for Paul and all believers, *to be present with the Lord.*<sup>11)</sup> Our *desire to depart* is a desire *to be with Christ.*<sup>12)</sup> And Christ is not in Sheol, but in heaven,<sup>13)</sup> from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.<sup>14)</sup> *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord* FROM HENCE-

1) 2 Cor. 5, 4.

2) Gal. 3, 26.

3) Hebr. 12, 1.

4) Ibid.

5) 2 Tim. 4, 7.

6) Phil. 1, 21.

7) John 5, 24. 1 John 3, 14.

8) John 5, 24.

9) Luke 23, 43.

10) 2 Cor. 12, 2. 4.

11) 2 Cor. 5, 8.

12) Phil. 1, 23.

13) Luke 24, 51. Col. 3, 1. Hebr. 8, 1.

14) 1 Thess. 4, 16. Phil. 3, 20.

FORTH: *Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors.*<sup>1)</sup> There is no room for purgatory in the *great gulf fixed between*<sup>2)</sup> heaven and hell. And neither heaven nor hell is a dormitory for disembodied souls. The grave is the *coemeterium of them that sleep in the dust of the earth.*<sup>3)</sup> But hell is a *place of torment,*<sup>4)</sup> and heaven is the happy home where Lazarus is *comforted* in Abraham's bosom:<sup>5)</sup> hence, *to be with Christ is far better* than to be in the flesh, and we *have a desire to depart.*<sup>6)</sup>

As Paul uttered this hope and desire, he looked forward to the time of his departure.<sup>7)</sup> When he writes, *For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain,*<sup>8)</sup> he expects to be numbered with *them which are asleep.*<sup>9)</sup> Yet the same apostle also says, *We shall not all sleep.*<sup>10)</sup> He includes himself when he says, *WE which are alive and remain unto the coming of Christ.*<sup>11)</sup> This is not a contradiction, but an alternative. The apostle knew that *the Lord is at hand.*<sup>12)</sup> Christ had foretold his *coming in the clouds of heaven.*<sup>13)</sup> He had not stated the day and hour of his coming, but had expressly said, *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man.*<sup>14)</sup> He had earnestly warned all his disciples, *Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come.*<sup>15)</sup> *Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.*<sup>16)</sup> His first message to them after his ascension was, *This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*<sup>17)</sup> Hence, from that day to this, God's people have been ready for the coming of their King, *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*<sup>18)</sup> *Our conver-*

1) Rev. 14, 13.

2) Luke 16, 26.

3) Dan. 12, 2.

4) Luke 16, 28; cf. 22—25.

5) Luke 16, 22—25.

6) Phil. 1, 22 f.

7) Cf. 2 Tim. 4, 6.

8) Phil. 1, 21.

9) 1 Thess. 4, 15.

10) 1 Cor. 15, 51.

11) 1 Thess. 4, 15, 17.

12) Phil. 4, 5.

13) Matt. 26, 49; 24, 30. Mark 13, 26.

14) Mark 13, 32. Matt. 24, 36.

15) Matt. 24, 42.

16) Luke 12, 40; cf. Luke 21, 36.

17) Acts 1, 11.

18) 1 Cor. 1, 7.

sation, says Paul, *is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.*<sup>1)</sup> Meanwhile many fell asleep in Christ,<sup>2)</sup> Stephen, the protomartyr,<sup>3)</sup> James, the apostle,<sup>4)</sup> and others who had seen the risen Lord,<sup>5)</sup> and each of these instances of mortality was apt to remind those who remained that their dissolution, too, might be impending. Besides, persecution was grinding its ax and preparing its fagots, and Paul was ready to be offered and considered the time of his departure at hand.<sup>6)</sup> And from that time to this, God's children have been ready for the summons which may at any moment call them hence. This daily and hourly readiness for our departure is by no means inconsistent with our daily and hourly readiness for our Lord's coming. Paul was prepared either to be *unclothed* or to be *clothed upon*,<sup>7)</sup> to *sleep* or to be *changed*.<sup>8)</sup> So are we. We know that *it is appointed unto man once to die.*<sup>9)</sup> We likewise know that *the Son of man cometh*<sup>10)</sup> at his appointed time, and that when he shall come, he will find a generation of children of God waiting for his coming, and a generation of unbelievers resembling the generation which was taken away by the flood,<sup>11)</sup> all of whom shall see him coming in the clouds of heaven.<sup>12)</sup> Then the wise virgins, who shall be ready for the coming of the bridegroom, will go in with him to the marriage.<sup>13)</sup> But *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.*<sup>14)</sup> Our mortal bodies, as now constituted, are not fit for the bliss and glory of the life to come. Hence, *when the last trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible,*<sup>15)</sup> those who shall be alive and remain<sup>16)</sup> shall be changed *in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.*<sup>17)</sup>

1) Phil. 3, 20.

4) Acts 12, 12.

7) 2 Cor. 5, 4.

10) Luke 12, 40.

13) Matt. 25, 10.

16) 1 Thess. 4, 15—17.

2) 1 Cor. 15, 18.

5) 1 Cor. 15, 6.

8) 1 Cor. 15, 51.

11) Matt. 24, 37—39.

14) 1 Cor. 15, 50.

17) 1 Cor. 15, 52.

3) Acts 7, 60.

6) 2 Tim. 4, 6.

9) Hebr. 9, 27.

12) Matt. 24, 30.

15) 1 Cor. 15, 52.



They shall *not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.*<sup>1)</sup>

Thus, then, whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord.<sup>2)</sup> We live as in an Advent season, looking forward with the eyes of faith to the fulness of the time, to the last advent of Christ.

## B. THE LAST ADVENT OF CHRIST.

The first advent of Christ, his coming in lowliness to redeem the world, was predicted by numerous prophecies, and many were the signs whereby his people were to be reminded of these promises and their approaching fulfillment. The last advent of Christ, his coming in power and glory to judge the world and lead his people home, was also predicted by himself, his angels, and his holy apostles, and many are the signs whereby we are to be reminded of these predictions and their impending fulfillment.

Jesus himself foretold his second advent in plain words to his friends and to his enemies. In Caiphaz' palace we hear him say, *Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.*<sup>3)</sup> And with his disciples he repeatedly discoursed on the *coming of the Son of man*,<sup>4)</sup> when *they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.*<sup>5)</sup> In the very hour when he was taken out of their sight by a chariot of clouds, his angel messengers again assured them of his return, saying, *Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*<sup>6)</sup> St. Paul speaks of *the coming of the Lord*,<sup>7)</sup> *the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ*,<sup>8)</sup>

1) 2 Cor. 5, 4.

2) Rom. 14, 8.

3) Matt. 26, 64.

4) Matt. 24, 3—51; 25, 1—46. Luke 12, 36 ff.; 21, 25—36. Mark 13.

5) Matt. 24, 30; cf. Mark 13, 26.

6) Acts 1, 11.

7) 1 Thess. 4, 15; cf. 1 Cor. 1, 7.

8) Tit. 2, 13.

when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.<sup>1)</sup> St. Peter testifies that the day of the Lord will come,<sup>2)</sup> and he will fulfill the promise of his coming.<sup>3)</sup> Like a herald St. John announces the advent of the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth, saying, Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.<sup>4)</sup> And the close of the last chapter of Revelation unites the petition of the waiting bride with the promise of the coming bridegroom in the words: Surely, I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.<sup>5)</sup>

In these texts and their contexts, the impending advent of Christ is described as a visible coming, visible to all the tribes of the earth,<sup>6)</sup> friends and enemies.<sup>7)</sup> It will be a coming with power and great glory. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.<sup>8)</sup> And it will be a last coming, to finish up the business of this world and time by the resurrection of all the dead, the final judgment, and the consummation of all things. Nowhere in all these predictions and descriptions of the Lord's coming is there any indication of or any room for a millennium of temporal or mundane felicity for the church and the children of a first resurrection from the dead in visible presence with Christ. To the end of time, the church of Christ shall be under the cross, amid dangers and trials and tribulations unceasing and increasing, as the shadows lengthen and deepen in the eventide of a declining day.<sup>9)</sup> When the disciples were with the Master on the mount of Olives, they said, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?<sup>10)</sup> And thus to us also

---

1) 1 Thess. 4, 16.

2) 2 Pet. 3, 10.

3) 2 Pet. 3, 4.

4) Rev. 1, 7; cf. v. 5.

5) Rev. 22, 20.

6) Matt. 24, 30.

7) Rev. 1, 7.

8) Matt. 25, 31.

9) John 16, 33. Matt. 24, 24. 1 Tim. 4, 1.

10) Matt. 24, 3.

the signs of the coming of Christ our Lord are the signs of the end of the world.

When the waters of the deluge had subsided, God established a covenant with mankind, that no flood should again destroy the earth or cut off all flesh, and said, *I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.*<sup>1)</sup> Thus had the rainbow received a new significance. It was thenceforth to stand between God and man as a token and testimony of a covenant established between them and as a surety of its fulfillment. In this sense, the bow in the clouds is now not only a physical phenomenon, but a sign, according to the definition, *Signum est, quod sub sensum aliquem cadit, et quiddam significat.*<sup>2)</sup> In like manner, Christ also has pointed out various phenomena and endowed them with a peculiar significance, whereby they are to be signs or tokens of the approach of a coming and predicted event, signs of his coming, and of the end of the world.<sup>3)</sup> When we see phenomena appearing in the sun and the moon and the stars, obscurations and other changes;<sup>4)</sup> when we hear the roaring of the waves of the sea;<sup>5)</sup> when false Christs and false prophets arise and show signs and wonders;<sup>6)</sup> when the gospel is preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations;<sup>7)</sup> when Jerusalem is being trodden down of the Gentiles;<sup>8)</sup> when the Jews in all lands are everywhere Jews;<sup>9)</sup> when antichrist, that man of sin, the son of perdition, is revealed, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;<sup>10)</sup> when materialism pervades the masses, as it did in the days of Noe,<sup>11)</sup> and unbelief prevails:<sup>12)</sup> all these things are continually and ever anew to remind us of the coming of the Son of man, of the great change of heaven and earth which,

1) Gen. 9, 13.

3) Matt. 24, 3; cf. 33.

5) Ibid.

7) Matt. 24, 14.

9) Matt. 24, 34.

11) Matt. 24, 37—39.

2) Cicero, de imit. rhet., 48.

4) Luke 21, 25.

6) Mark 13, 22. Matt. 24, 24.

8) Luke 21, 24.

10) 2 Thess. 2, 3—8. 1 John 2, 18.

12) Luke 18, 8.



with every revolution of the luminaries above, is drawing nearer and nearer, until the last great sign, *the sign of the Son of man*, the Son of man himself *in visible presence, shall appear in heaven*.<sup>1)</sup>

*Little children*, says St. John, *it is the last time*;<sup>2)</sup> and St. Peter, *The end of all things is at hand*.<sup>3)</sup> And lest we be unmindful of such admonitions, our Savior directs our senses to the signs above us and about us, which are to be to us the tokens of his covenant, *Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me*.<sup>4)</sup> And to all generations of his disciples he says, *When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors*.<sup>5)</sup> And as in the days of St. John, so in these latter days, and to the end of time, *the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come!*<sup>6)</sup>

A. G.

(To be continued.)

## THEOLOGICAL TRAINING IN THE EARLY LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA.

(Concluded.)

When, in 1779, a State University was organized at Philadelphia, Pastor Kunze was made one of the Trustees. He was also a member of the committee of five who were to devise a plan for the organization of the university. Kunze urged the propriety of due regard for the interests of the German element in the population of the state by affording them an opportunity to cultivate their mother tongue together with the languages and sciences, there being entire counties populated by Germans whose children understood not a word of English. After some opposition the Board of Trustees yielded to Kunze's arguments, and it was

1) Matt. 24, 30.

2) 1 John 2, 18.

3) 1 Pet. 4, 7.

4) Rev. 22, 12.

5) Matt. 24, 33.

6) Rev. 22, 17.

arranged that a German professorship be created, and that all the learned languages and the rudimentary sciences should be taught in German by the German Professor. The first incumbent of the office was Kunze himself, and a few years later he wrote: "I am pleased to know that herein I have established something for the Germans of which, by the grace of God, the church and posterity will reap the benefit." His successor in the chair was Pastor J. H. Ch. Helmuth, who had served as assistant instructor in the German department before Kunze's removal to New York. But the hopes which had been entertained for this German work were not realized. The number of German students was small, and of these but few, if any, had the ministry in view. Dr. Kunze complained that at Philadelphia he had but six students, and that he doubted if one of them would study theology. In 1785 the number of German students was somewhat increased, and a few of them contemplated theology. But the ministers complained of having very little time to devote to their instruction.

In 1787 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania held its fortieth convention at Lancaster, Pa., and on the last day, June 5, the following item was entered on the record:—

"19. All the preachers have been invited to attend the dedication of the German High School (Franklin College) on the morrow at 10 o'clock A. M., all accepted the invitation."

At the end of the Protocol, we find the following

"Appendix.

"On Wednesday, June 6th, the entire Ministerium went in procession to the dedication of Franklin College, which was held in the Lutheran church. A reformed preacher, G. Weiberg, opened with prayer, the Episcopal preacher, Mr. Hutchins, delivered an English address on John 7, 15, Preacher Mühlenberg, a German address on Ephes. 6, 4, and the Moravian preacher, Mr. Herbst, closed with an English prayer."

This medley was in good keeping with the character of the institution thus consecrated. A charter and an appropriation of 10,000 acres of State land had been obtained from the legislature for a German High School, in consideration, as the petition said, of the great merits of the Germans in behalf of the State. The studies to be pursued in this school were "German, English, Latin, Greek, and other learned languages, Theology, the useful arts, sciences, and literature." The Board of Directors was to consist of no less than 45 members, of whom 15 were to be chosen from the Lutheran, 15 from the Reformed or Calvinist, and 15 from some other Christian church. The President was to be taken from the Lutheran church and the Reformed church alternately. In consideration of the "talents and virtues of His Excellency, Mr. Benjamin Franklin, and the services rendered by him to humanity in general and to this country especially," the institution was named Franklin College. In an announcement to the Germans of Pennsylvania, the Trustees said among other things:—

"In the beginning of this brief address it has been uttered in praise of you that many of you are godly people, and that the Germans generally endeavor to provide for the maintenance of religion. But, dear friends, whence will you in future take preachers and school-teachers, if you neglect to put your children to study? . . . Do you think that in this way your churches and schools will endure? Your descendants will either have to content themselves with most inferior men, or abandon their language and religion, and of this you will have laid the foundation, having, besides, burdened yourselves with a heavy load of sin. . . . See, dear friends, as things have been going on in many places, it is impossible that German churches should continue. The churches which you now have will, within a few years, stand deserted, and what will then become of the increased number of Germans among you? Are there not even now many districts where those who dwell there



hear no sermon for six or perhaps eight weeks, and the poor young people grow up like savages?"

But these admonitions failed of the desired effect. Although, besides Dr. H. Mühlenberg, the first President, three instructors, one of whom was Rev. F. Melsheimer, were engaged, the number of students was and remained small. Contributions were slender, the largest sum being 200 £, which came from Benjamin Franklin. Before the close of the first year the treasury showed a shortage of 244 £, and the Treasurer announced: "I wrote a short time ago, how wretched the circumstances of our College are, and how far we are in arrears. These arrearages are increasing from day to day, and unless you gentlemen at Philadelphia put your shoulders to the wheel, we shall inevitably go down, and soon." The College did not get beyond a struggling existence while it was conducted under the original plan. In 1818, the jubilee year of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, another effort was made to put the school upon a firmer footing. A committee of the German Reformed Synod appeared at the convention of the Ministerium for the purpose of "conferring with a committee of the Lutheran Synod" on the question "how efforts might be made to provide institutions for the education of young preachers." What action the Lutheran Synod took in the matter appears from the following extracts from the Protocol.

"*Resolved*, that a committee be appointed to confer with our brethren of the venerable Reformed Synod concerning the proposed plan. Messrs. Schmucker, Jäger and Mühlenberg were appointed on this committee.

"The committee which had been appointed yesterday to confer with the committee of the Evangelical Reformed Synod, and devise ways and means for the founding of a joint institution of learning, in order to train young men in the future for the ministry, presented the following report:

"1. That they have acted according to their instructions, and have ascertained that in the city of Lancaster

there is an institution known by the name of Franklin College, which, in the year 1787, was given to the German Lutheran and Reformed Churches for this purpose, and to which a present of 10,000 acres of land had been given.

"2. That the committee greatly lament that this institution has been so much neglected thus far, and thereby the purpose which the State, from the beginning, had intended it to serve has been frustrated.

"3. That the committee has carefully examined the charter of this institution, and has found it necessary to recommend that the President of the same be instructed to call a general assembly of all the Trustees of the same.

"4. That Messrs. Hofmeyer and Endress shall see that this convocation be brought about.

"5. That a committee shall be appointed by both Synods in common, to prepare a plan, according to which the above-mentioned institution can be best adapted for the above-mentioned purpose.

"This report was fully approved, and Messrs. Schmucker, Lochmann, Geisenhainer, Sr., Endress, and Mühlenberg, were appointed a committee, in accordance with the 5th section of the report."

The Minutes of the convention of the Pennsylvania Synod at Baltimore, in 1819, contain the following record:

"Pastor Endress now made a verbal report in the name of the committee appointed the previous year to confer with a committee of the Reverend Reformed Synod concerning the matter of Franklin College at Lancaster.

"*Resolved*, That one hundred dollars shall be paid out of our treasury toward the support of the College at Lancaster, provided the Reverend Synod of the Reformed does the same.

"*Further Resolved*, That a committee on our part be appointed to meet, at the next Reformed Synod at Lancaster, with a committee of the same, to prepare a plan for a Theological Seminary.

“*Resolved*, That Pastors Schmucker, Endress, Lochmann, Mühlenberg, and Ernst shall constitute the committee.”

The further history of Franklin College does not concern us here. It was, as far as the training of ministers for the Lutheran church was concerned, a failure from beginning to end.

Another educational plant which was greeted with fond hopes but bore little or no fruit was *Union Seminary*, in Greene County, Tenn. Its founders were Philip Henkel, one of Paul Henkel's sons, and a young Englishman with a classical education but little theological training, Joseph E. Bell, a Licentiate in the Synod of North Carolina. At the convention of this synod held in 1817 a letter was read in which the writer, “the Rev. Mr. Bachmann, preacher in Charleston, S. C.,” expressed his desire “to see a seminary for the education of preachers established” in the South. The fulfillment of this wish was already in progress. In a book written by the Secretary of the Synod, G. Shober, for the Jubilee of the Reformation in 1817, and published with the approval and recommendation of the synod, we read:—

“A Seminary, on a small scale, to teach Theology, and the Greek, Latin, German, and English languages, was begun in the state of Tennessee, Greene County, under the inspection of the Rev. Philip Henkel and Joseph E. Bell. It is to be continued under the direction of this synod, for the purpose of educating young men to the gospel ministry. The Rev. Joseph E. Bell is now tutor. The establishment is recommended to the fostering care of all our congregations and Christian friends; to establish funds for its support, in the congregations belonging to our sphere, we propose, during next May, to entreat for and receive donations, for the purpose of creating a fund for its support.”

A similar announcement was embodied in the minutes of the convention of the same year, with the following additional remarks:—



“By request the said Seminary was gladly received under our advice and support, in the confiding expectation that, with the help of God, from these small beginnings, in the salubrious and cheap location, an institution so long and earnestly desired may grow to such maturity, that in it many able teachers and missionaries will be educated, who shall be well fitted and instructed to go to all parts of the world as preachers of the glorious gospel of the atonement of Jesus, ready to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them. Thousands of present and future generations will then, here in time and hereafter in eternity, greet with joyful exultation and repay with everlasting gratitude those who so well instructed them and also those who have contributed their generous gifts toward the support and maintenance of this beginning. And every one who shall enjoy this will share the experience of the sainted Gellert and sing with him:—

What joyful blessing this must be,  
To lead a soul, my God, to Thee!

“Let us, then, dear brethren, cheerfully take up this work and, prompted by the love we bear toward Jesus and the souls he bought with so great a price, contribute from the means he has given us, (as is now done throughout all Christendom), that, also through our service, our Savior’s kingdom may be extended. — Next May a collection will be raised in our congregations for said purpose of what each may be prompted to contribute toward the great object. And the gifts of all Christians will at all times be accepted with many thanks, and every preacher will receive them and deliver them to the treasurer, who will keep a record of all benefactors.”

At the time when this little Seminary came into being and, a few years later, passed out of existence, what is now the oldest school of theology in the Lutheran church of America had begun its course. Ten years after the open-

ing of Hartwick Seminary as an organized institution, the Seminary at Gettysburg was put under way. The rise and progress of these schools marks a new period in the history of theological training in the Lutheran church of our country, and we return to our survey of the era of unsuccessful attempts at providing schools for educating ministers. These failures did not prevent the Lutheran church in those days from having its theological students. They were "home students," the "home" being either that of the student, who dwelled under the paternal roof while he was under his pastor's guidance and supervision as he pursued his studies, or the home of the pastor, who gave his student board and lodging until he was so far advanced that he could be put to work in some neighboring congregation, some affiliated charge of his preceptor, where he would instruct the young, acquire some experience in preaching, and meanwhile continue his course of study and reading. Later he would be given charge of a congregation of his own, to preach and baptize as a licensed candidate, perhaps also to perform other ministerial acts, until he would finally be admitted to ordination and thus become a minister in the full sense of the word. While this work of educating men for the ministry was, in a measure, a private enterprise of individual pastors, it was in various ways under the control of the church. We know that Dr. Wrangel's students began to preach at the discretion of their teacher. But in 1779 the Synod passed the following unanimous resolution:—

"Resolved, that in the future no preacher shall permit a candidate or student to preach without first having brought him before a meeting of the Ministerium, which should first examine him and furnish him with a license."

By the requirements made at these examinations, the studies whereby the candidates would have to qualify themselves to meet such requirements were determined both as to quality and quantity. Of an examination held during the synod of 1784 we have the following record:—

"The candidate recommended is Mr. Daniel Kurtz, a son of the venerable Mr. Kurtz, of Yorktown. He had been instructed for almost three years in languages, theological and other sciences, and his teacher, Rev. Mühlenberg, of Lancaster, gave him a good testimonial, in reference to his diligence and good character, and requested that he be examined and granted a license. Hereupon he was brought forward and examined. Pastor Voigt started with Hebrew, and had the first Psalm translated, and asked various grammatical questions. He also had Matt. 28, 19. 20 translated and explained. Dr. Kunze examined him farther in Greek, and Rev. 1, 1—6 and Hebr. 11, 21 were translated.

"The gentlemen present expressed their satisfaction, and gave him the following questions to be answered in writing:

"(1) How is it proved that Christ was not merely a teacher of men, but that he also offered true satisfaction for men?

"(2) What are the works and benefits of the Holy Spirit?

"(3) By what evidence do men know that they are converted?

"(4) How is the baptism of children proved?

"(5) How is the eternity of the punishment of hell accounted for?

"(6) Are the Apostles infallible in the exposition of doctrine?"

This examination was not exceptionally rigorous. Some familiarity with the ancient languages, especially Greek and Hebrew, was deemed necessary for a minister. Thus we find in the record of the synodical convention of 1779 this resolution:—

"Resolved, that Candidate Ernst's license be renewed until the next synodical conference, and he be exhorted to continue to apply himself to theological studies, and especially the ancient languages."



In 1788 a Candidate by the name of Lütge applied for recognition. The Ministerium "requested from him a written outline on Mark 1, 15: Repent ye and believe the Gospel." "Mr. Lütge handed to the Synod his outline on Mark 1, 15. It was read, and the decision postponed to the next day." On the next day "the case of Mr. Lütge was again taken up, and on motion, resolved to give him a license to preach and to baptize, on the following conditions: 1. That he shall improve his knowledge of Greek. 2. Keep a diary of his official acts. 3. Present to the Ministerium testimonials from the elders and deacons of the congregations in which he preaches."

At the Synod of the following year "the license of Licentiate Mr. Lütge was upon his request renewed for a year, with the admonition that he should diligently study the original languages, and the other theological branches."

The Constitution of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in force in 1781 contained, in "Chapter Fifth," these paragraphs:—

"§ 27. Every candidate desiring to be received must first undergo a brief examination in the ancient languages and theology, and then only does he receive a license. Before the ordination, however, the licensed candidate submits himself to a stricter examination, in which written questions are answered also in writing. The former may be called a test, the latter an examination."

"§ 30. That licensed candidate who is convinced that, by private application, he has advanced sufficiently to be able to undergo the examination referred to above in § 27 may, in a spirit of meekness, make known his desire to be ordained in open session, but never without the afore-mentioned conviction as to a knowledge of the ancient languages and theology. No one will in future be ordained without both these requirements, unless in a very extraordinary instance, or the most urgent necessity."

All these various regulations were, in the course of time, modified in various ways. Thus, in the Constitution of 1792, which was also adopted in New York, we read:—

“Every ordained minister possessing the requisite qualifications, time and opportunity, has the right and liberty to take under their instruction young men, desirous of devoting themselves to the ministry, and by oral instruction, the recommendation of good books, and practical directions, to prepare them for the service of the Lord, and whenever a student so instructed has obtained a systematic knowledge of the doctrines of salvation, the gift of speaking, an unblemished character and evidences of experimental religion, his instructor may permit him to preach on trial.”

When students were so far advanced that they were considered capable of entering on actual work in the church, they were first made “Catechists.” Of these the Constitution of 1792 said:—

“The catechist is subject to the general superintendence of the Ministerium and its officers, and besides to the particular care of one of the neighboring ordained ministers, who is to be named as such in the catechist’s license, and whom he has to respect as his instructor and father; whose directions he follows in continuing to serve the Lord, and the extension of his theological knowledge, and whose advice he seeks in important cases.”

“No one is to be admitted as catechist, whose walk and conversation is not blameless; he must be at least twenty years of age, have acquired a systematic knowledge of Christian doctrines and ethics; he ought to possess some knowledge of human nature, manifest a gift of speaking, and above all things a practical knowledge of experimental religion.”

“He is to be examined by the Ministerium, and appointed by a license to the office of a catechist, before he can officiate in that capacity.”

“It is his duty to keep a journal of his official acts, and to send annually the same, with two catechetical ser-

mons that he has written, for the inspection of the Ministerium and the Ministerial Session, together with his license for renewal."

The examination and licensure of catechists and candidates was assigned to the Ministerial Meeting, which was held after the adjournment of the Synod and the dismissal of the lay delegates. Hereof the VII Chapter of the Constitution said:—

"1. After the transaction of all the Synodical business the Ministerium holds a meeting for a half or an entire day.

"4. If candidates are to be licensed or ordained, or if catechists are to receive license as candidates, or if students are to be appointed as catechists or as candidates, first of all they are to undergo an examination respecting their doctrine and life."

"5. The President asks all the licensed candidates and catechists to hand in their journals, sermons and licenses and divides the ordained ministers into committees, to examine the journals and sermons, and have them read by the candidates and catechists, accompanied by their comments, for the improvement of the understanding and heart of the composers; he also appoints the hour to report thereon to the Ministerium."

"6. After examination of candidates the licensed candidates and catechists withdraw from the Ministerium; the committees report and the Ministerium decides upon the reports and the issue of the examination...."

The Constitution left it to "every ordained minister" to decide whether he "possessed the requisite qualifications" for preparing young men for the ministry. But in 1803 the Ministerium of New York appointed Dr. Kunze, certainly its ablest theologian, to this important task, making him the first Professor of Theology appointed by a Lutheran Synod in America. His successor in this office as in the Presidency of the synod was F. H. Quitman, a rationalist who had retained little more of Lutheranism than the



name. In 1804, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania also resolved "that, in accordance with the plan adopted, Rev. Mr. Melsheimer, in Hanover, the preachers in Philadelphia [Helmuth and Schmidt], Rev. Mr. Lochmann in Lebanon, Rev. Mr. Schmucker in Hagerstown, Rev. Mr. Geisenheiner in New Hanover, Rev. Mr. Streit in Winchester, be teachers for the instruction of young preachers." The students who pursued their studies under these recognized teachers of theology were looked upon as wards of the church. In 1807 the Synod was "informed that several young men were desirous of devoting themselves to the ministry, namely, Messrs. Heine, Simon and Henrich Riemenschneider." It was "*Resolved*, That the sum of one hundred dollars from the Synodical Treasury be granted each of these students, to enable them to continue their studies, which sum, however, is to be paid to their teachers." In other instances the aid extended to indigent students was granted "as a loan." In the Synod of North Carolina a "Philological Society" was organized for the publication of periodical literature, and a part of the proceeds was to be devoted to "the support of needy students of theology."

Of the results of this home student method of theological training it must be said that, as a rule, they were not of a very high order at any time, and that they sank to a perceptibly lower level in the course of time. This is evident from a great many manuscripts still extant and bearing evidence of the attainments of their writers. The examinations were less rigid in later than in earlier days. In 1789 a resolution was passed "that the Licentiates should hand in to the Ministerium their journals and four complete sermons each year, as otherwise the ministerium had no opportunity to judge correctly of their presentation of divine truth." In the Constitution of 1792 the number of sermons to be submitted was reduced to two, which, with the diaries, were to be examined by committees of the Ministerium. The records of later years show that these rules were very

rarely carried out. In very few instances two sermons were handed in. In some cases the sermons, in others the journals, in still others both, were absent. The report of 1811 says:—

“The committees brought in their opinions of the papers of the candidates and catechists.

“First committee: Mr. Mensch’s has our entire approval; we recommend him for ordination. Mr. Scriba’s, middling (*mittelmaessig*). Mr. D. Schaefer’s, inferior even to Scriba’s disposition.

“Second committee: Mr. Hecht’s, middling and dry, adorned with poetic flight; Miller’s fine, thorough, edifying; Baetis’, good and from the heart, but full of Anglicisms; S. Schäfer’s, good, if he had had another text than Noah’s dove.

“Third committee: Mr. Heim’s, simple, but from the heart, full, however, of orthographic errors; Engel’s, good, but it is doubtful whether he wrote it; Weigand’s, simple, but much for the heart; Ulrich’s, it is very doubtful whether he wrote it himself.

“Fourth committee: Tiedemann’s petition for renewal of his license shall be granted; Merckel’s paper is very defective, and taken from others; Osterlo’s, doubtful whether he wrote it himself; Sackmann is a useful man, and his sermon is full of common sense; Meendsen and Vanhoff give evidence of great diligence and skill.”

Two of the candidates, Sanno and Heine, had submitted neither a sermon nor a journal, and we have seen what the opinions of the examiners were of some of the papers before them. Yet the record says:—“The licenses of the following men were renewed: Sanno, Mensch, D. Schäfer, Heine, Baetis, Ullrich, Weigand, Heim, Osterlo, Vanhoff, Merckel, Sackmann, S. Schäfer, Scriba, Miller, Hecht, Meendsen.”

In the subsequent year an apparent effort was made to raise the standard of qualification for the ministry. A “mo-

tion for an addition to the constitution" introduced at this convention contained the following regulations:—

"A fourth rank of preachers shall be appointed, with the title of Ordained Deacons.

"The number of preachers hitherto ordained shall not be increased by receiving any who

(a) does not have, in addition to other theological attainments, also the ability correctly to translate the Greek Testament and a Latin prose writer, at least with the aid of a lexicon, and who cannot write his mother tongue orthographically;

(b) who has not had a three years' course of theological training in the United States or for the same length of time served congregations here in an exemplary way.

(c) With these limitations it is left to the judgment of the Ministerium, to ordain candidates immediately as pastors or only as deacons...."

During the same session "the President declared in the name of the Ministerium, that hereafter none should be ordained as pastor who has not been regularly educated for the ministry."

The motion mentioned above was "given over to be considered until next year." But before the next meeting of the Synod the father of the bill had himself stepped out of the ranks of the ministry, and it was not until 1815 that the matter again came up for consideration. In the Ministerial Meeting of that year the wish was again expressed "that another class or order of preachers might be introduced." The action of the Ministerium, according to the protocol, was this:—

"According to a resolution of the Ministerium, none could be made pastors except such as had received systematic instruction by an ordained preacher for the term of three years, and had done something in the languages. But since there are many good and useful men to be found in our connection who have had no opportunity to acquire



such knowledge, and since it was not desired to exclude them from ordination altogether, it was deemed just and necessary to ordain them, at least as deacons.

"In the year 1812 already, at Carlisle, a motion of this sort was presented to the Ministerium for consideration, and it was now resolved to adopt the said motion, made at that time."

But the rule was made to work the wrong way. In the Ministerial Meeting of 1816 it was "resolved that (as an amendment to a resolution adopted at Carlisle, in the year 1812) if a preacher have already received formal ordination as deacon, by the laying on of hands, no further formal laying on of hands shall be deemed necessary to advance him to the office of a pastor; that, therefore, a simple declaration of the assembled pastors, through the President or Senior of the Ministerium, shall be regarded as sufficient for this purpose." On the same day it was, furthermore, "resolved that Messrs. Hecht, Mueller, Vanhoff, Ernst and Ulrich be declared Pastors, and Messrs. George Heim, Baetis, Engel, Sackmann, Meendsen, Becker, Münnig, Tiedemann, Hemping, Schindel, and Herbst be ordained to the office of Deacon." A few years later thirteen Deacons were, on the same day, "advanced to the grade of Pastors." On the same occasion six candidates were ordained Deacons, and the Report says: "It had always been customary to hold examination before ordination, but because of a lack of time, and other urgent business, it was omitted this time." In the subsequent year, 1821, another number of candidates were ordained Deacons, and again it was "*Resolved*, To dispense with the other customary examinations this year."

This was in the dark Middle Age of American Lutheranism.

A. G.

---

## WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

---

Answered by one who does not know.

---

When Charles Darwin wrote his book on the *Origin of Species*, he had, of course, a great deal to say on Species; but on one thing connected with this subject he left those who knew no more than he could tell them in profound ignorance, and that was the *origin* of species. When in the winter of 1899—1900, Professor Adolf Harnack, of the University of Berlin, delivered sixteen lectures on the subject, *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, he had, of course, a great deal to say on Christianity. But if there was anything that the “six hundred students drawn from all the Faculties” who heard these lectures, and the readers of the German and English printed editions, did certainly not learn from Professor Harnack, it was a correct answer to the question which forms the title of the English translation published with the author’s approval and preface,—*What is Christianity?* There is, however, this difference between Darwin and Harnack, that the former knew considerably more about species than the latter knows about Christianity. In fact, we do not doubt that even Prof. Harnack has more correct notions concerning the subject of animal species than he has on the subject of his sixteen lectures.

Or how should Prof. Harnack know what Christianity is? He cannot know by examining himself; for he is not a Christian. He openly denies everything distinctively Christian, as, the triune God, the Divine nature of Christ, the resurrection of Christ’s body from the dead, the vicarious atonement, justification by faith. He could hardly put forth more conclusive proof of his profound ignorance of the nature of Christianity than he does by mistaking himself for a Christian. Here is his own portraiture as drawn by himself in the closing words of the last lecture:—

Let me, if you please, speak of my own experience, as one who for thirty years has taken an earnest interest in these things. Pure knowledge is a glorious thing, and woe to the man who holds it light or blunts his sense for it. But to the question, Whence, whither, and to what purpose, it gives an answer to-day as little as it did two or three thousand years ago. It does, indeed, instruct us in facts; it detects inconsistencies; it links phenomena; it corrects the deception of sense and idea. But where and how the curve of the world and the curve of our own life begin—that curve of which it shows us only a section—and whither this curve leads, knowledge does not tell us. But if with a steady will we affirm the forces and the standards which on a summit of our inner life shine out as our highest good, nay, as our real self; if we are earnest and courageous enough to accept them as the great Reality and direct our lives by them; and if we then look at the course of mankind's history, follow its upward development, and search, in strenuous and patient service, for the communion of minds in it, we shall not faint in weariness and despair, but become certain of God, of the God whom Jesus Christ called his Father, and who is also our Father. P. 300 f.

But while a Christian may, in a way and measure, study the nature of Christianity by observing his own inner life, the picture thus obtained must always be subjected to the test of close comparison with the portraiture of the children of God delineated in the infallible word of God, whence all true notions of spiritual things must ultimately be derived. And here again Prof. Harnack has placed himself at a serious, even fatal, disadvantage. He knows of no infallible word of God. Of the Old Testament he says:—

The new church possessed a sacred book, the Old Testament. . . . What a blessing to the church this book has proved! . . . Yet the possession of this book has not been an unqualified advantage to the church. To begin with, there are many of its pages which exhibit a religion and a morality other than Christian. . . . There was always a danger of an inferior and obsolete principle forcing its way into Christianity through the Old Testament. This, indeed, was what actually occurred. Nor was it only in individual aspects that it occurred; the whole aim was changed. P. 186.

The New Testament, also, is, in Harnack's estimation, far from being a reliable source of information. He says:—



Our authorities for the message which Jesus Christ delivered are—apart from certain important statements made by Paul—the first three Gospels. Everything that we know, independently of these Gospels, about Jesus' history and his teaching, may be easily put on a small sheet of paper, so little does it come to. In particular, the fourth Gospel, which does not emanate or profess to emanate from the apostle John, cannot be taken as an historical authority in the ordinary meaning of the word. . . . Although, therefore, his work is not altogether devoid of a real, if scarcely recognisable, traditional element, it can hardly make any claim to be considered an authority for Jesus' history; only little of what he says can be accepted, and that little with caution. P. 19 f.

And again:—

The Gospels are not "party tracts": neither are they writings which as yet bear the radical impress of the Greek spirit. In their essential substance they belong to the first, the Jewish, epoch of Christianity, that brief epoch which may be denoted as the palaeontological. That we possess any reports dating from that time, even though, as is obvious in the first and third Gospel, the setting and the composition are by another hand, is one of those historical arrangements for which we cannot be too thankful. P. 21.

And once more:—

It is true that, measured by the standard of "agreement, inspiration and completeness," these writings leave a very great deal to be desired, and even when judged by a more human standard they suffer from not a few imperfections. Rude additions from a later age they do not, indeed, exhibit—it will always remain a noteworthy fact that, conversely, it is only the fourth Gospel which makes Greeks ask after Jesus—but still they, too, reflect, here and there, the circumstances in which the primitive Christian community was placed and the experiences which it afterwards underwent. People nowadays, however, put such constructions on the text more readily than is necessary. Further, the conviction that Old Testament prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus' history had a disturbing effect on tradition. Lastly, in some of the narratives the miraculous element is obviously intensified. P. 23.

Holding such views of the gospel narratives, Harnack is but consistent when he deals with these divine records as he does, unceremoniously casting aside and disregarding what he discards as unworthy of his consideration. The

Christmas tidings of great joy, of the babe in the manger who was Christ the Lord, the Savior, whose cradle song the angels sang, in short, the whole story of the conception, birth and childhood of Jesus, he brushes away like cobwebs are swept away by the housemaid's broom. We quote:—

Our evangelists, as we know, do not tell us anything about the history of Jesus' early development; they tell us only of his public activity. Two of the Gospels do, it is true, contain an introductory history (the history of Jesus' birth); but we may disregard it; for even if it contained something more trustworthy than it does actually contain, it would be as good as useless for our purpose. P. 30.

Paul, too, is silent; so that we can be sure that the oldest tradition knew nothing of any stories of Jesus' birth.

We know nothing of Jesus' history for the first thirty years of his life. Is there not a terrible uncertainty here? P. 30.

Most certainly, a terrible uncertainty, and not only here, but everywhere. For where is the criterion for distinguishing those parts of the gospel which are to be considered better than cobwebs and rubbish? Harnack still seems to think that there are such parts of the gospels; he says:—

Now, however certain it may be that our materials are insufficient for a "biography," they are very weighty in other respects, and even their silence on the first thirty years is instructive. They are weighty because they give us information upon three important points: In the first place, they offer us a plain picture of Jesus' teaching. . . . P. 31.

But when it comes to answering the question, What is Christianity? Harnack is again driven to disavow in part even what he finds recorded of "Jesus' teaching." Even here he distinguishes between husk and kernel:—

What was kernel here, and what was husk, history has itself showed with unmistakable plainness, and by the shortest process. Husk were the whole of the Jewish limitations attaching to Jesus' message; husk were also such definite statements as "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." P. 180.

And now, Prof. Harnack comes to us as a "historian," in the performance of what he considers "the historian's task." He says, more explicitly:—

What is Christianity? It is solely in its historical sense that we shall try to answer this question here; that is to say, we shall employ the methods of historical science, and the experience of life gained by studying the actual course of history. P. 6.

Let us suppose that a man, claiming to be a socialist, but openly discountenancing all the distinctive tenets and principles of socialism, should appear before an audience and announce a lecture on the question, *What is Socialism?* Suppose that this man, having at the outset declared his intention to answer the question in its historical sense, should begin by casting aside as spurious or for other reasons unreliable a considerable part of what the masses of real socialists and their best teachers and leaders looked upon as the most valuable sources of historical information on their doctrine and practice, and that even of what he retained he should reject a part as husk. What would this man's standing for reliability be in the eyes of the socialists among his hearers? Or to what credence would he be entitled in the eyes of any man of average intelligence?

But what if this pseudo-socialist should, over and above all this, make such execrable use of the "kernel" of the historical material before him, that he must be held guilty of gross perversion and persistent ignorance of facts and principles clearly set forth in records and testimonies? This is the use to which Harnack puts his garbled "first three Gospels" and "certain important statements made by Paul." These Gospels and St. Paul do, indeed, give us and every one who will read and accept what they plainly say a true and full answer to the question, What is Christianity? The answer which Harnack purports to draw from this source is a great falsehood from beginning to end. The lectures also teem with falsehoods in detail, denials of truths and facts, assertions of untruths, false statements in the face of plain words to the contrary, falsehoods—but let the reader judge for himself. We give the following specimens in their natural order.

Miracles, it is true, do not happen; but of the marvellous and the inexplicable there is plenty. In our present state of knowledge we have become more careful, more hesitating in our judgment, in regard to the stories of the miraculous which we have received from antiquity. That the earth in its course stood still; that a she-ass spoke; that a storm was quieted by a word, we do not believe, and we shall never again believe; but that the lame walked, the blind saw, and the deaf heard, will not be so summarily dismissed as an illusion.

From these suggestions you can arrive for yourselves at the right position to take up in regard to the miraculous stories related in the Gospels, and at their net results. In particular cases, that is to say, in the application of general principles to concrete statements, some uncertainty will always remain. So far as I can judge, the stories may be grouped as follows: — (1) Stories which had their origin in an exaggerated view of natural events of an impressive character; (2) stories which had their origin in sayings or parables, or in the projection of inner experiences on to the external world; (3) stories such as arose in the interest of the fulfilment of Old Testament sayings; (4) stories of surprising cures effected by Jesus' spiritual force; (5) stories of which we cannot fathom the secret. It is very remarkable, however, that Jesus himself did not assign that critical importance to his miraculous deeds which even the evangelist Mark and the others all attributed to them. . . . And the remarkable fact that these very evangelists, without appreciating its range, hand down the statement that Jesus "did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief," shows us from another and a different side, with what caution we must receive these miraculous stories, and in what category we must put them. P. 28 f.

If, however, we take a general view of Jesus' teaching we shall see that it may be grouped under three heads. They are each of such a nature as to contain the whole, and hence it can be exhibited in its entirety under any one of them.

*Firstly, the kingdom of God and its coming.*

*Secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul.*

*Thirdly, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.*

P. 51.

Take whatever parable you will, the parable of the sower, of the pearl of great price, of the treasure buried in the field — the word of God, God himself, is the kingdom. It is not a question of angels and devils, thrones and principalities, but of God and the soul, the soul and its God. P. 56.



Jesus Christ calls to every poor soul; he calls to every one who bears a human face: You are children of the living God. P. 67.

In the combination of these ideas — God the Father, Providence, the position of men as God's children, the infinite value of the human soul — the whole Gospel is expressed. P. 68.

In thus expressing his message of the higher righteousness and the new commandment of love in these four leading thoughts, Jesus defined the sphere of the ethical in a way in which no one before him had ever defined it. But should we be threatened with doubts as to what he meant, we may steep ourselves again and again in the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. They contain his ethics and his religion, united at the root, and freed from all external and particularistic elements. P. 74.

The history of religion marked an enormous advance, religion itself was established afresh, when through poets and thinkers in Greece on the one hand, and through the prophets in Palestine on the other, the idea of righteousness and a righteous God became a living force and transformed tradition. The gods were raised to a higher level and civilised; the warlike and capricious Jehovah became a holy Being in whose court of judgment a man might trust, albeit in fear and trembling. P. 76.

No religion, not even Buddhism, ever went to work with such an energetic social message, and so strongly identified itself with that message as we see to be the case in the Gospel. How so? Because the words "Love thy neighbor as thyself" were spoken in deep earnest; because with these words Jesus turned a light upon all the concrete relations of life, upon the world of hunger, poverty and misery; because, lastly, he uttered them as a religious, nay, as *the* religious maxim. Let me remind you once more of the parable of the Last Judgment, where the whole question of a man's worth and destiny is made dependent on whether he has practised the love of his neighbor. P. 98 f.

It is not only that the Gospel preaches solidarity and the helping of others; it is in this message that its real import consists. In this sense it is profoundly socialistic, just as it is also profoundly individualistic. P. 99.

Before we examine Jesus' own testimony about himself, two leading points must be established. In the first place, he desired no other belief in his person and no other attachment to it than is contained in the keeping of his commandments. P. 125.

Let us first of all consider the designation, "Son of God." Jesus in one of his discourses made it specially clear why and in what sense he gave himself this name. The saying is to be found in

Matthew, and not, as might perhaps have been expected, in John: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." It is "knowledge of God" that makes the sphere of the Divine Sonship. It is in this knowledge that he came to know the sacred Being who rules heaven and earth as a Father, as *his* Father. The consciousness which he possessed as being the *Son of God* is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God as the Father and as his Father. Rightly understood, the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God. Here, however, two observations are to be made: Jesus is convinced that he knows God in a way in which no one ever knew him before, and he knows that it is his vocation to communicate this knowledge of God to others by word and by deed — and with it the knowledge that men are God's children. In this consciousness he knows himself to be the Son called and instituted of God, to be *the* Son of God, and hence he can say: *My* God and *my* Father, and into this invocation he puts something which belongs to no one but himself. How he came to this consciousness of the unique character of his relation to God as a Son; how he came to the consciousness of his power, and to the consciousness of the obligation and the mission which this power carried with it, is his secret, and no psychology will ever fathom it. P. 127 f.

Jesus was the "Messiah" and was not the Messiah; and he was not the Messiah, because he left the idea far behind him; because he put a meaning into it which was too much for it to bear. P. 141.

He takes the publican in the temple, the widow and her mite, the lost son, as his examples; none of them knew anything about "Christology," and yet by his humility the publican was justified. P. 143.

*The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son.* This is no paradox, nor, on the other hand, is it "rationalism," but the simple expression of the actual fact as the evangelists give it. P. 144.

The sentence "I am the Son of God" was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself, and to put that sentence there side by side with the others is to make an addition to the Gospel. But no one who accepts the Gospel, and tries to understand him who gave it to us, can fail to affirm that here the divine appeared in as pure a form as it can appear on earth. P. 146.

The Gospel is no theoretical system of doctrine or philosophy of the universe; it is doctrine only in so far as it proclaims the reality of God the Father. It is a glad message assuring us of life eternal,

and telling us what the things and the forces with which we have to do are worth. By treating of life eternal it teaches us how to lead our lives aright. It tells us of the value of the human soul, of humility, of mercy, of purity, of the cross, and the worthlessness of worldly goods and anxiety for the things of which earthly life consists. And it gives the assurance that in spite of every struggle, peace, certainty, and something within that can never be destroyed, will be the crown of a life rightly led. What else can "the confession of a creed" mean under these conditions but to do the will of God, in the certainty that He is the Father and the one who will recompense? P. 146 f.

Any one who will look into history will find that the sufferings of the pure and the just are its saving element; that is to say, that it is not words, but deeds, and not deeds only but self-sacrificing deeds, and not only self-sacrificing deeds, but the surrender of life itself, that forms the turning point in every great advance in history. In this sense I believe that, however far we may stand from any *theories* about vicarious sacrifice, there are few of us after all who will mistake the truth and inner justice of such a description as we read in Isaiah liii.: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend" — it is in this light that Jesus' death was regarded from the beginning. Wherever any great deed has been accomplished in history, the finer a man's moral feelings are, the more sensible will he be of vicarious suffering; the more he will bring that suffering into relation to himself. Did Luther in the monastery strive only for himself? — was it not for us all that he inwardly bled when he fought with the religion that was handed down to him? But it was by the cross of Jesus Christ that mankind gained such an experience of the power of purity and love true to death that they can never forget it, and that it signifies a new epoch in their history.

Finally, in the third place: no reflection of the "reason," no deliberation of the "intelligence," will ever be able to expunge from the moral ideas of mankind the conviction that injustice and sin deserve to be punished, and that everywhere that the just man suffers, an atonement is made which puts us to shame and purifies us. P. 158 f.

If the resurrection meant nothing but that a deceased body of flesh and blood came to life again, we should make short work of this tradition. But it is not so. The New Testament itself distinguishes between the Easter message of the empty grave and the appearances of Jesus on the one side, and the Easter faith on the other. Although the greatest value is attached to that message, we are to hold the Easter faith even in its absence. The story of Thomas is told for the exclusive purpose of impressing upon us that we must

hold the Easter faith even without the Easter message: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." The disciples on the road to Emmaus were blamed for not believing in the resurrection even though the Easter message had not yet reached them. The Lord is a Spirit, says Paul; and this carries with it the certainty of his resurrection. The Easter *message* tells us of that wonderful event in Joseph of Arimathaea's garden, which, however, no eye saw; it tells us of the empty grave into which a few women and disciples looked; of the appearance of the Lord in a transfigured form — so glorified that his own could not immediately recognise him; it soon begins to tell us, too, of what the risen one said and did. The reports became more and more complete, and more and more confident. But the Easter *faith* is the conviction that the crucified one gained a victory over death; that God is just and powerful; that he who is the firstborn among many brethren still lives. . . . Certain it is that what . . . the disciples regarded as all-important was not the state in which the grave was found but Christ's appearances. But who of us can maintain that a clear account of these appearances can be constructed out of the stories told by Paul and the evangelists; and if that be impossible, and there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter faith to be based on them? Either we must decide to rest our belief on a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts, or else we must abandon this foundation altogether, and with it the miraculous appeal to our senses. But here, too, the images of the faith have their roots in truth and reality. Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the matter of appearances, one thing is certain: *This grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal.* . . . What else can we believe but that the earliest disciples also found the ultimate foundation of their faith in the living Lord to be the strength which had gone out from him? It was a life never to be destroyed which they felt to be going out from him; only for a brief span of time could his death stagger them; the strength of the Lord prevailed over everything; God did not give him over to death; he lives as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep. P. 160—163.

If there be in all this long series of extracts one true statement concerning Christ, the Gospel of Christ, and Christianity, we have failed to find it and would thank any reader who would point it out. What is said on miracles is false in what it states and in what it suggests. The five



groups of "miraculous stories" are five falsehoods. It is false that Jesus differed from the evangelists in the estimate of his miracles. It is false that "these miraculous stories" must be received with caution, and that this falsehood is based on certain sayings of Christ is another falsehood. It is not true that Jesus' teaching may be grouped under the three heads given on p. 51. Neither is it true that "the word of God, God himself, is the kingdom of God." It is false that according to Jesus' teaching every one who bears a human face is a child of the living God. The Pharisees bore human faces; yet Jesus said to them, *Ye are of your father the devil*. Neither the "whole Gospel," nor any part of the Gospel, is expressed in the combination of the ideas enumerated on p. 68. It is a fatal falsehood that the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount contained the ethics and the religion of Christ, and it is not true that Christ had introduced a new and unheard-of definition of the sphere of the ethical. The next quotation is a veritable bundle of blasphemous lies culminating in the horrid utterance that, as the heathen gods were elevated and civilised, so "the warlike and capricious Jehovah became a holy Being." The falsehood that the injunction, *Love thy neighbor as thyself*, is the religious maxim of Jesus, that in this message the real import of the Gospel consists, and that Jesus desired no other belief in or attachment to him than is contained in the keeping of his commandments, leads more people to hell than the sins of murder, theft, and adultery, taken together. The chain of falsehoods running through the extract dealing with the designation, "Son of God," amounts to a complete denial of the Divine Sonship of Christ. Of course, Jesus was the Messiah, though Harnack falsely says he was also not the Messiah. The publican was not justified by his humility. Indeed, the statement that the Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son, "is not a paradox," but an open, unmitigated falsehood. So is the statement that the sentence "I am the

Son of God" was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself. Or how in the world did it get in, if not from the lips of Jesus? Is Matt. 26, 63 f. or Mark 14, 61 f. an addition to the Gospel? It is not true that the Gospel "is doctrine only as it proclaims the reality of God the Father," and what in the words following this quotation purports to be a summary, is but another perversion of the Gospel into a jumble in which nothing specifically Christian is to be found. The same must be said of the next specimen, which is nothing but a somewhat elaborate and highly profane denial of Christ's vicarious sacrifice. In like manner is what Harnack says of "the resurrection" a conglomerate of falsehoods, the whole trend of which is a disavowal of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of Christ Jesus from the dead. It is not true that "we are to hold the Easter faith even in the absence of the Easter message." What is said of the purpose of the story of Thomas is false; the very words of Jesus quoted give it the lie; for they are not: Blessed are they that have not *heard* and yet have believed. What is said of the disciples on the road to Emmaus is equally false; for the Easter message *had* reached them, their own words recorded Luke 24, 22—24 being in evidence. It is not true that the Pauline dictum, *The Lord is a Spirit*, "carries with it the certainty of his resurrection." See Luke 24, 39. When Harnack says, with reference to "the stories told by Paul and the evangelists," that if "there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter faith to be based on them?" this is a falsehood based on a falsehood. The alternative, "Either we must decide to rest our belief on a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts, or else we must abandon it altogether," is another falsehood resting on false suppositions. And, finally, when Harnack would make his hearers and readers believe that he, too, like "the earliest disciples," rejoiced in the Easter faith that Jesus "lives as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep"—this is but

another falsehood; for he has no Easter faith as surely as he has discarded the Easter message.

In fairness to Prof. Harnack it must be said that the treatment which the first three Gospels receive at his hands is neither better nor worse than that which he accords to Paul and the early Christian church. We exemplify.

No long period elapsed before it was taught in the Church that the all-important thing is to know how the person of Jesus was constituted, what sort of physical nature he had, and so on. Paul himself is far removed from this position — "Whoso calleth Christ Lord speaketh by the Holy Ghost" — but the way on which he ordered his religious conceptions, as the outcome of his speculative ideas, unmistakeably exercised an influence in a wrong direction. That, however great the attraction which his way of ordering them may possess for the understanding, it is a perverse proceeding to make Christology the fundamental substance of the Gospel, is shown by Christ's teaching, which is everywhere directed to the all-important point, and summarily confronts every man with his God. P. 184.

Under the influence of the Messianic dogmas, and led by the impression which Christ made, Paul became the author of the speculative idea that not only God was in Christ, but that Christ himself was possessed of a peculiar nature of a heavenly kind. P. 185.

The most important step that was ever taken in the domain of Christian doctrine was when the Christian apologists at the beginning of the second century drew the equation: the Logos = Jesus Christ. Ancient teachers before them had also called Christ "the Logos" among the many predicates which they ascribed to him; nay, one of them, John, had already formulated the proposition: "The Logos is Jesus Christ." But with John this proposition had not become the basis of every speculative idea about Christ; with him, too, "the Logos" was only a predicate. But now teachers came forward who previous to their conversion had been adherents of the platonico-stoical philosophy, and with them the conception "Logos" formed an inalienable part of a general philosophy of the world. They proclaimed that Jesus Christ was the Logos incarnate, which had hitherto been revealed only in the great effects which it exercised. P. 202 f.

The identification of the Logos with Christ was the determining factor in the fusion of Greek philosophy with the apostolic inheritance and led the more thoughtful Greeks to adopt the latter. Most of us regard this identification as inadmissible, because the way in

which we conceive the world and ethics does not point to the existence of any logos at all. P. 204.

Even though the Christological formula were the theologically right one — what a departure from the Gospel is involved in maintaining that a man can have no relation with Jesus Christ, nay, that he is sinning against him and will be cast out, unless he first of all acknowledges that Christ was *one* person with two natures and two powers of will, one of them divine and one human. Such is the demand into which intellectualism has developed. Can such a system still find a place for the Gospel story of the Syrophoenician woman or the centurion of Capernaum? P. 236 f.

We were not preoccupied against Prof. Harnack by adverse criticism, having read a hundred times as much of his works as about them. We believe that, if he were invited to lecture on the question, What is Socialism? he would go to work, if he accepted the invitation, and would, with the aid of the writings of Lasalle, Marx, Bebel, and others, some volumes of "Der Socialdemocrat," the "Programs" of Eisenach and Gotha, the Wyden Manifesto, and other sources of reliable information, prepare a fairly profitable historical treatise on Socialism. But we are, also, fully persuaded that an audience assembled to hear a lecture on this subject would simply refuse to tolerate what the hearers of his sixteen lectures tolerated and even appear to have appreciated. It would be impossible to find in all Germany six hundred sane men who would voluntarily sit through sixteen lectures dealing with Socialism as Harnack's do with Christianity, and an audience of socialists treated with such bosh on their political creed would call the speaker down as a malicious ignoramus before he had finished his first lecture. Harnack's portraiture of Christianity is far worse than a caricature, which, while it distorts the features of its subject, always leaves enough of them for recognition. Harnack's is not a distorted Christianity. It is not Christian truth and satanic error mixed and blended together, as in Romanist theology. It is unmixed and unmitigated heathendom, a religion of works by which man must save himself. Har-



nack's Jesus Christ is not the Christ of history and of Scripture, but a fiction, a Jesus who never and nowhere existed. The Jesus of history was born at Bethlehem, God's very Son, not only by knowledge, but begotten of the Father from eternity, and a virgin's son, laid in a manger, carried into Egypt, reared at Nazareth; and all this Harnack's Jesus was not. Harnack's Jesus was born in Harnack's brain. Harnack's Gospel, too, was "made in Germany," though after a pattern which has hung and still hangs in hundreds of shops in all continents and in the devil's own smithy. Christ's Gospel is the Gospel of salvation by faith, without the deeds of the law. Harnack's Gospel is a gospel of damnation without faith, according to the curse of the law; "for as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," and "he that believeth not shall be damned."

But again we must not be unjust to Prof. Harnack. Though these lectures have certainly added largely to a burden of tremendous responsibility resting upon him, he by no means carries this fearful load alone. He is but one of many, a representative man, an exponent of modern scientific theology, which is neither modern, nor scientific, nor theology. His errors are old Arian and Pelagian and other heresies condemned many centuries ago by the Christian church, brushed up and decked out in trappings of more recent fashion. His methods are those of Marcion and other earlier Gnostics and of scores of rationalists of later times, and fully as unscientific as the endeavors of an idiot who would investigate the nature and motion of the moon by applying a stethoscope to a bombshell. His theology is but one form of the monster which has in our day usurped the chairs of Christian doctrine, theology in no sense, neither as to its source, nor to its substance, nor to its form, nor to its end and aim, but a philosophy gone crazy, according to the word of St. Paul: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." A. G.

---

## VARIANT INTERPRETATIONS.

---

*Sensus literalis unus est.* This is the fundamental article of Hermeneutics everywhere; in theology, in jurisprudence, in historical research, wherever the sense of the words of human speech is to be established, it must be on this rule, which admits of no exception. Says Dr. Lieber: "No sentence, or form of words, can have more than one 'true sense,' and this is the only one we have to inquire for. This is the very basis of all interpretation. Interpretation without it has no meaning. Every man or body of persons, making use of words, does so, in order to convey a certain meaning; and to find this precise meaning is the object of all interpretation. To have two meanings in view is equivalent to having no meaning. The interpretation of two meanings implies absurdity."<sup>1)</sup> This is true and well said. The same author says, by way of exemplification: "The fictitious law case, composed by Pope and Fortesque as having ensued in consequence of Sir John Swale having bequeathed to his friend, Mr. Stradling, 'all my black and white horses,' when there were found six black horses, six white ones, and six that were black and white, or pied horses, is certainly entertaining. Yet the question, as it was stated by those gentlemen, 'whether the pied horses were included in the legacy,' ought never to have arisen. As there can be but one meaning attached to any sentence, the testator could not have meant by his words all black and all white horses, and, at the same time, all black and white horses. The only difficulty arising from this will could be this, whether the testator meant to bequeath to Mr. Stradling all black and all white horses, *or* all black and white horses."<sup>2)</sup>

---

1) Legal and Political Hermeneutics, 3d Ed., pp. 74 f.

2) Ibid., p. 76.

Thus, also, the words of holy Scripture are the means whereby the precise notions or thoughts which were in the mind of their Author are to be conveyed to the mind of the reader or hearer. From the words of St. Paul those who read them are to understand his knowledge in the mystery of Christ.<sup>1)</sup> The prophets themselves searched what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify by the words they wrote.<sup>2)</sup> The question before the interpreter of Scripture is not what notions he *might* connect with the words of the text, but what thoughts or ideas the Holy Spirit *did* actually connect therewith and utter thereby. In most instances this intended meaning is so clear from the words employed, that there is no room for reasonable doubt as to their signification. In fact, there is no doctrine of Christian theology which is not set forth in unmistakable terms in some text of Scripture which may for this reason be agreed upon by all orthodox theologians as a *sedes doctrinae* of such doctrine. It is because of these texts, chiefly, that also the layman in theology, who does not enjoy the advantages of linguistic and hermeneutical training, can, even without the assistance of learned expositors, derive directly from the inspired Word a correct knowledge of all the doctrines which make us wise unto salvation.

On the other hand, however, there are in the Scriptures not a few texts which afford peculiar difficulties to the interpreter, difficulties which may concern the usage, or form, or arrangement, of the words, or their relation to the context, or the parallelism of the text, or apparent historical discrepancies, or several or all of these together. In many instances, these difficulties can, by close attention to the words, their form and arrangement, the *usus loquendi*, and the previous and subsequent context, and by the careful application of correct exegetical methods, be conclusively overcome, so that a solution is reached which all who are

---

1) Eph. 3, 4.

2) 1 Pet. 1, 11.

capable of grasping the reasons for and the methods leading to such solution will accept as satisfactory. In a familiar text we read: *For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.*<sup>1)</sup> What can this mean, *when we believed*, or, as Luther has it, *da wir's glaubten*? Was the faith of Paul and the Roman Christians a thing of the past? Now, it can be shown that the Greek aorist sometimes denotes the beginning of an action which is still in progress, or the entrance upon a state which still continues. In the passage quoted and in various other places,<sup>2)</sup> the aorist of πιστεῦεν is evidently used in this sense, and ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν means, *when we first believed*, or, *da wir zum Glauben kamen*. This solution, simple as it is, ought to be satisfactory to all who are accessible to a grammatical argument.

But there are still other instances, in which an agreement is not so easily reached. We do not now think of such *crucis interpretum* as the μεσίτης of Gal. 3, 20 with its three hundred and more interpretations. We will point out a few other texts more of a kind to represent the class. The words of St. Paul, Eph. 4, 9 f., have been very generally expounded as a passage treating of the descent of Christ into hell and his ascension into heaven, and we find them as proof texts in most of our catechisms and dogmatical handbooks under these heads. Yet there are those who, with Luther, hold that these verses speak of Christ's humiliation and exaltation. The two interpretations are incompatible with each other as far as the *descensus* is concerned. For while Christ's ascension is a part or stage of his exaltation, and one interpretation might include the other in this point, his descent into hell is a stage of Christ's exaltation, and words which mean Christ's humiliation cannot mean his descent into hell. Again, we read: *We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye re-*

---

1) Rom. 13, 11.

2) Acts 19, 2. 1 Cor. 3, 5; 15, 2. Gal. 2, 16.



*ceive not the grace of God in vain.* 2 Cor. 6, 1. These words are adduced in the *Formula of Concord* as speaking of the concurrence of the converted man in the performance of good works. We quote: "But this does not occur from our fleshly natural powers, but from the new powers and gifts which the Holy Ghost has begun in us in conversion, as St. Paul expressly and earnestly exhorts that '*as workers together*' we '*receive not the grace of God in vain.*' 2 Cor. 6, 1." <sup>1)</sup> But below this paragraph, in the Latin text, we find the following remarks: "2 Cor. 6, 1. Συνεργοῦντες παρακαλοῦμεν: We who are servants or co-workers with God beseech you who are '*God's husbandry*' and '*God's building*' (1 Cor. 3, 9) to imitate our example, that the grace of God may not be among you in vain." <sup>2)</sup> This will never do. *Sensus literalis unus est!* The text, speaking of συνεργοῦντες, refers either to the apostle and other ministers, or to their converted hearers, who are admonished by them, and not to both, and if the exposition in the note, § 66, is, as it is, exegetically right, the exposition in § 65, as above quoted, is exegetically wrong. Yet our fathers evidently felt no compunction in publishing the *Formula of Concord* with both interpretations on the same page. St. Paul writes according to the English Bible: *The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.* <sup>3)</sup> This text is adduced in the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* as follows: "Moreover we think concerning the righteousness of reason thus, viz. that God requires it, and that, because of God's commandment, the honorable works which the Decalogue commands must necessarily be performed, according to the passage (Gal. 3, 24): '*The law was our schoolmaster;*' likewise (1 Tim. 1, 9): '*The law is made for the ungodly*'" <sup>4)</sup> Here the assumption is that the text demands the *justitia civilis*, of which civil government is the guardian. Again, we read in the *Formula*

1) F. C. Sol. Decl. II, 65; p. 604.

2) Ibid. 66.

3) Gal. 3, 24.

4) Apol. Art. IV, 22; p. 91.

of *Concord*: "These two doctrines we believe and confess, viz. that even to the end of the world they should be diligently inculcated in the church of God, although with the proper distinction, in order that, through the preaching of the Law and its threats in the ministry of the New Testament, the hearts of impenitent men may be terrified, and be brought to a knowledge of their sins and to repentance; but not in such a way that they inwardly despair and doubt, but that (since '*the law is a schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith,*' Gal. 3, 24, and thus points and leads us not from Christ, who '*is the end of the law,*' Rom. 10, 4), they be on the other hand comforted and strengthened by the preaching of the holy Gospel concerning Christ our Lord.'"<sup>1)</sup> Here the Law is not viewed as the taskmaster for the government of the members of human society, but as an educator leading us to Christ by working in us the knowledge of sin which is to prompt us to seek Christ and salvation in him as set forth in the Gospel. These two interpretations are again at variance with each other in such a way that if the one stands, the other must fall. In fact, we hold that both must fall in view of the context, according to which the Law is here neither considered as the promoter of the *justitia civilis* among the nations, nor as the monitor who is to lead the members of the church of God to a knowledge of their sins, that they may flee to Christ, but as the domestic servant provided for the Old Testament dispensation in Israel according to the flesh until Christ, in the fulness of the time, should come and, with him, the new era, in which God's people should be no longer under the *παιδαγωγός*, the Mosaic law, whose office was to terminate at the time appointed of the father. If this interpretation is right, as we hold it to be, our example will go to show that two variant interpretations, while they cannot both be right, may both be wrong, even though

---

1) F. C. Sol. Decl. VI, 24; p. 638.

they appear in the Symbols of the Church, not doctrinally, but exegetically, wrong.

Another example. St. Paul writes to the Ephesians: *Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.*<sup>1)</sup> Of several interpretations of this text, we would mention two which have found their supporters in the Lutheran church. The one, to which, for several reasons on which we will not now enlarge, we have always given the preference, takes the genitive τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν as *genitivus subjecti*, and the apostles and prophets are then conceived as the architects or builders of the temple of God, as Paul also describes himself elsewhere, when he says: *We are laborers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*<sup>2)</sup> In the doctrine of the apostles and prophets, as laid down in the Scriptures, Jesus Christ is the chief and central subject. *To him give all the prophets witness,*<sup>3)</sup> and the words of St. Paul, *We preach Christ crucified,*<sup>4)</sup> are true of all apostles. Thus finding this concept of the apostles as builders who laid the foundation of the church occurring repeatedly in other epistles of Paul, while we know of no other text in which the apostle conceives himself and other holy men of God as the foundation of the church, we have never been able to persuade ourselves to adopt another interpretation, also grammatically admissible, according to which τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν is *genitivus appositivus*, and the apostles and prophets them-

1) Eph. 2, 20.

3) Act. 10, 43; cf. 3, 18.

2) 1 Cor. 3, 10; cf. Rom. 15, 20.

4) 1 Cor. 1, 23; cf. 2, 2.

selves in a certain respect are conceived as the foundation of the church. We know that this view has found the support of some of the most illustrious theologians of the Lutheran church. John Gerhard writes: "The church is set forth as a spiritual house. The corner stone is Christ; the foundation are the prophets and apostles according to their doctrine."<sup>1</sup> Baldwin, in his great commentary on the Pauline Epistles, writes: "The apostles and prophets are said to be the foundation, not with respect to their person, but to their doctrine."<sup>2</sup> Calov, in his *Biblia Illustrata*, says: "The apostles and prophets are here not viewed as the architects who laid the foundation: but their doctrine is said to be the foundation on which the believers are built, and in which doctrinal foundation the doctrine concerning Christ is prominent. Nor are the apostles and prophets here considered with regard to their persons, since they are themselves even as others built upon the foundation of the church; but with respect to their doctrine, which, according to the will of God, is to be the foundation of the church."<sup>3</sup> If this interpretation is exegetically correct, the interpretation preferred by us is exegetically wrong. The genitives must be either subjective or appositive; they might be neither, but they cannot be both. *Sensus literalis unus est*. If this text says that the apostles and prophets *are* the foundation, it just as certainly does not and can not say that they *laid* the foundation. Calov is technically or theoret-

1) Proponitur ecclesia tanquam domus quaedam spiritualis. Lapis angularis est Christus: fundamentum sunt prophetae et apostoli ratione suae doctrinae. Loci Theologici, II. p. 42.

2) Apostoli et Prophetae non dicuntur fundamentum respectu personae, sed doctrinae suae. Comment. in omnes Epistolas Pauli, p. 882.

3) Non hic Apostoli ac Prophetae spectantur ut Architecti, qui fundamentum posuere: sed doctrina eorum dicitur fundamentum cui superstructi fideles sunt: In quo doctrinali fundamento eminet doctrina de Christo. Neque hic spectantur Apostoli et Prophetae ratione personarum suarum, prout ipsi aequè ac alii superstructi sunt fundamento Ecclesiae, sed ratione doctrinae suae, quam Deus voluit esse Ecclesiae fundamentum. Bibl. Illustr., IV, 684.



ually right when, holding that the apostles and prophets with respect to their doctrine, are in this text viewed as the foundation of the church, he says, the apostles and prophets are here *not* viewed as the architects who laid such foundation.

While, however, two variant interpretations cannot both be *in principle* correct, both may very well be *doctrinally* correct. The *Formula of Concord* is doctrinally right when it says that concurrence in the performance of good works is to be ascribed to the regenerate only, while its reference to the *misapprehensions* of 1 Cor. 6, 1, in substantiation of this point, is exegetically wrong. What the *Apology* says concerning the use of the law is doctrinally correct, because the doctrine it maintains is clearly set forth in various passages of Scripture, though it cannot be exegetically derived from the text quoted from the epistle to the Galatians. Those who hold that the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell is taught in Eph. 4, 9 & are not accused of false doctrine by those who differ from them in the interpretation of that text, since what St. Paul may not teach in Ephesians is certainly taught in the first epistle of St. Peter. The doctrine which Gerhard and Calov and Baldwin find in Eph. 1, 10 by their construction is precisely the same which we find by ours, that the word of the apostles and prophets is *fundamentum doctrinæ* of the church. They and others who follow their exegesis do not deny what is taught in 1 Cor. 3, 10, that the apostles, as architects and builders, laid the foundation of the church, but they hold that in Ephesians the *modus operandi* is different, while the substance of the doctrine is the same. This is not the only instance of disagreement in exegesis with full agreement in doctrine. In Daniel we read, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.*<sup>1)</sup> Here, it has been said, the word *many* evidently stands for *all*. We do not accept this. The

1) Dan. 12, 2.

word *many* never stands for the word *all*, but *many* always means *many*, a *great number*, and *all* everywhere means *all*, the *whole number*. Thus, if we had no more comprehensive statement in the Scriptures concerning Christ's redemption, than that *he bare the sin of many*,<sup>1)</sup> the doctrine of the universality of the redemption would be without sufficient scriptural foundation. Yet, while we do not agree exegetically with those who, by supposing that *many* stood for *all*, find the resurrection of all the dead taught in Dan. 12. 2. and the redemption of all sinners in Is. 53. 12, we are fully agreed with them doctrinally, knowing that these doctrines are explicitly and clearly taught in other passages of Scripture, as when Christ says: *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth*;<sup>2)</sup> and when we read that Christ is *the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*,<sup>3)</sup> and gave *himself a ransom for all*.<sup>4)</sup>

We have an instance in the history of the Reformation which may be of interest as an example to show how in those days the same position was maintained, that discrepancy in exegesis must not be construed into disagreement in doctrine. When, in 1527, Agricola raised certain objections against Melanchthon's *Articuli de quibus egerunt per Venerabiles*, he also charged Melanchthon with false exegesis. In Art. XII Melanchthon had stated that the Law must be employed *ut converteantur rudēs homines*, and in substantiation thereof had quoted from Gal. 3. 19, *Lex est posita propter transgressionē, scilicet carēdas*. Luther, in his commentary, had taken a different view of the sense of this text, saying: *Legem dicit positam seu additam et appositam, ut transgressionē abundarent, eodem sensu, quo Ro. 5. dicitur Lex subintravit, ut abundaret delictum. . . . Est ergo*

1) Is. 53. 12.

2) John 5. 28; cf. 2 Cor. 5. 10. Acts 24. 15.

3) 1 John 2. 2.

4) 1 Tim. 2. 6.

*sensus: Lex propter transgressionem posita est, ut transgressio sit et abundet, atque sic per legem homo in sui cognitionem perductus quaerat manum miserentis Dei, qui sine lege peccatum ignorans sibi sanus videtur.*<sup>1)</sup> Agricola made a great noise about this discrepancy, and, vehemently advocating Luther's exegesis, posed as a defender of Luther's doctrine against a doctrinal deviation of Melanchthon, while, in fact, it was he who differed in doctrine from both Luther and Melanchthon. It seems that the latter found occasion to defend his orthodoxy against misgivings engendered among his friends. In a letter to Caspar Aquila he says: "Islebius (Agricola of Isleben) troubles me very much about the text from St. Paul. I am being called into court and, I think, will have to answer a capital charge, because of what I have written. I have, in my exposition, followed that opinion which I find the ancients, too, have embraced and which has nothing absurd about it. In the doctrine itself I agree with Luther, and there is no reason why I should be looked upon as dissenting from him, even though I interpret some passage somewhat differently. For who is there that does not do this?"<sup>2)</sup> Luther, of course, knew of the difference, and a letter to Agricola, in which Melanchthon briefly answers the several charges preferred by his opponent, appears to have passed through Luther's hands. In this letter Melanchthon says: "I was not ignorant of giving an exposition which differs from his . . . ; nor do I think that Luther is angry with me on this account."<sup>3)</sup> If Melanchthon had been equally conscious of a doctrinal difference between Lu-

1) Opp. Erl. XXVI, 286 f.

2) De Pauli loco satis me exerceat Islebius. Et jam vocor in aulam, causam dicturus capitis, opinor, propter illud scriptum. Ergo secutus sum illam sententiam in enarrando, quam video et veteres amplexos esse et nihil absurditatis habere. De dogmate ipso convenit mihi cum Luthero, nec propterea videri debeo ab illo dissentire, etiamsi aliquem locum paulo secius interpreter. Quis enim hoc non facit? Corp. Ref. IV, p. 958.

3) Non ignorabam me aliud exponere atque ille exposuit; . . . nec opinor mihi propterea succensere Lutherum. Corp. Ref. I, 905.

ther and himself, his language would have been different. But he knew that the doctrine he found in the text according to his interpretation was a doctrine also accepted by Luther as taught by St. Paul elsewhere, just as he himself acknowledged the doctrine which Luther derived from the same text by his interpretation as being set forth in St. Paul. He says in the letter already quoted: "For there is no doubt that Paul teaches that the Law was given for these purposes, first, to coerce the flesh by carnal righteousness, and, furthermore, to terrify the conscience. I have applied the interpretation of the Pauline text to the former effect of the Law, Luther applies it to the latter."<sup>1</sup>) What he would say is, while we differ exegetically, we agree dogmatically. As two agree with a third, they agree with each other.

In all this there is no sacrifice of any theological principle. The intended meaning of any text can be but one. Scripture is nowhere a waxen nose to be molded or shaped at will, but a sure prophetic word, fit to be a thoroughly reliable source and norm of doctrine and rule of life. As such it also affords a perfectly sufficient safeguard against all perversion of doctrine by faulty interpretation. All errors of human interpreters cannot permanently move or remove one single stone in the doctrinal foundation of Christianity as long as every interpretation is inexorably and unconditionally rejected which is in conflict with any doctrine or point of doctrine clearly set forth in the infallible word of God.

A. G.

---

1) Non enim dubium est, quin Paulus doceat, legem propter has causas latam esse, primum ad coercendam carnem justitia carnali, deinde ad terrendam conscientiam. Ego interpretationem Paulini loci ad affectum priorem legis accommodavi, Lutherus accommodat ad posteriorem. Ibid. 905. 906.

---



## THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM

WITH A

## PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

## THE CREED.

*(Continued.)*

Exod. 34, 6. 7: *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.*

Moses had, in obedience to the word of God, prepared two stone tables like those he had broken, and taken them up on mount Sinai. Then the Lord, the Son of God, stood with Moses and proclaimed the name of the Lord, as he was about to repeat the law of the tables. To proclaim the name of the Lord is to announce the will and counsel of God whereby he would be known by those to whom he manifests himself. While dealing with Moses and the children of Israel as their Lawgiver, establishing with this people a covenant bound up with a stringent code of law, yet he would not be known even to this people in his legislative, judicial and executive justice only, but also in his grace and mercy. God is merciful inasmuch as he has pity on the afflicted and bestows his benefits on the miserable. He is gracious as he confers his blessings regardless of the merits or demerits of those whom he would bless. He is long-suffering as he is not quickly provoked and has patience with those who offend him. All these are so many aspects of the goodness of God, which, being God himself, is infinite. Thus God is abundant in goodness, keeping mercy not for a few only, but for thousands, not punishing but forgiving offenses against his holy will, under whatever name they may come, iniquity, transgression, or sin.

1 John 4, 8: *God is love.*

These words occur twice in the same chapter, here and in the 16th verse, the Greek form being in both instances, *ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*. There are other texts in which we are told that God has loved us, loved the world,<sup>1)</sup> loved the people,<sup>2)</sup> loved us with an everlasting love,<sup>3)</sup> with a love surpassing that of a mother toward her child.<sup>4)</sup> But nowhere else in the Scriptures do we find this truth uttered with the terseness and force peculiar to this statement that *God is love*. The same can be said of no created being in heaven and in earth. If it could, it would still predicate but the finite love of such finite being. But to say that God is love is to say that this love is infinite as God himself is infinite, a boundless, endless, illimitable ocean of incomprehensible love.

Rom. 1, 19. 20: *Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.*

In the previous texts the nature and attributes of God are set forth as by divine revelation in the written word of God. But while certain things concerning God can be known only from the word of revelation, the existence and some of the attributes of God may, in a measure, be known and are thus *γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *what is knowable of God*, in the light of nature and human reason. God has, in a measure, revealed himself also to such as have no knowledge of the written word, who walk in the darkness of heathendom. For of such the apostle says that God has showed, *ἐφανερώσεν*, *made manifest*, to them what is known to them concerning him. God is a spirit, invisible to human eyes. But while the eyes of the body can not see God, his divine nature and attributes, which are invisible, yet *νοούμενα καθορᾶται*,

1) John 3, 16.

2) Dent. 33, 3.

3) Jer. 31, 3.

4) Is. 49, 15.

the eyes of the mind, human reason, can behold him, his eternal power and Godhead, *θεϊότης*, as, from the works of creation, man, a rational being, may conclude that all the innumerable works that make up the universe must have an almighty maker, the Maker of heaven and earth. This revelation is as old as the world, *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου*, since *the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork*.<sup>1)</sup> A brute, which is without reason, can know nothing of God. But when man, a rational being, denies the existence of God and fails to search after a more extensive knowledge of him, he is without excuse. Every page of the book of nature bears the stamp and imprint and teems with profound thoughts of its Author, though there be idiots and inebriates who cannot read. A. G.

---

## Theological Review.

---

**Gospel Sermons.** *Country Sermons vol. IV.* By Rev. F. Kuegele. Augusta Publishing Company, *Crimora, Va.* 1901. 334 pages. Price, \$1.00.

This is a second volume of sermons on the familiar gospel lessons of the church year, containing the second half of the series, the sermons on the pericopes for the twenty-seven Sundays after Trinity. In addition to these the volume contains a Harvest Sermon, a sermon on the Reformation, a sermon on Mission, and a sermon for the Young. All these sermons are doctrinal sermons in the best sense of the term. They were doubtless highly edifying to the congregation before which they were preached, and to which this well printed edition was dedicated by the author. But these expositions of Scripture texts and exhibitions of Scripture doctrine and applications of Scripture truth will also prove highly instructive and truly edifying to those who will read them as

---

1) Ps. 19, 1.

they should be read and studied. Here we find no pyrotechnics of brilliant rhetoric, no subtle speculations of philosophy in the gown and bands of theology, no outbursts of cheap emotional sentimentalism, but the simple and sober statements of the law and the testimony, set forth and applied to Christian hearers, in language that a child may understand, in arguments that people of average intelligence and Christian training can comprehend, and yet in style and diction with which also those of refined and cultured minds will have no reason to be offended. If we are not mistaken, our author has by years of painstaking care in preparing his manuscripts for the press acquired a habit of rounding out his sentences in a way that has contributed toward making this volume even more enjoyable than its predecessors. We tender our cordial thanks for this valuable addition to English Lutheran homiletical literature.

A. G.

---

**Sunday-School Hymnal.** *By authority of the English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and other States.*  
Pittsburg, Pa. American Lutheran Publication Board.  
1901. 440 pages. Price, \$1.50.

That the English Lutheran church has only begun to produce or acquire a literature of her own is apparent everywhere. In doctrinal, exegetical, historical, homiletical, catechetical, devotional, apologetical, theology we have small beginnings, and most of what we have is the growth of recent years. The short period of English Lutheranism in the days of the Reformation was not productive of a rich harvest of theological works, and what was published was largely translated from German or Latin originals, and the seventeenth century, which gave to the German Lutheran church in abundance what, next to the treasures of the century of the Reformation, is to this day classical in Lutheran theology, was barren of English Lutheran literature.

All this is true particularly and preeminently with regard to Lutheran hymnology. The Lutheran church is,



above all other churches, a singing church, and it was again the German Lutheran church whence Lutheran churches of other tongues drew the greater part of what is best in their hymnbooks. In England, too, the first hymnbook, published by Coverdale, contained twenty-two hymns of Luther and hymns of Cruciger, Speratus, Spengler, and other contributors to Lutheran hymnody in Germany. But while in Germany, Norway, Sweden, and other countries, Lutheran psalmists of later days, especially of the seventeenth century, continued to add to what the era of the Reformation had yielded forth, the end of the Lutheran movement in England also signified the cessation of Lutheran psalmody in England. A number of translations, some of which were hardly fit to be used, was all that appeared of English Lutheran sacred verse, until new first fruits began to sprout from American soil. These too were chiefly translations from the German. But when the first English hymnbooks for Lutheran congregations in America were made, neither those who made them, nor those for whom they were made, were imbued with the spirit of genuine Lutheranism. It was under the influence of those unpropitious times that traditions took root which have not been eradicated to the present day. This must be said of the texts as well as of the tunes. And traditions, both good and evil, are apt to be very powerful. Thus to this day hymns are found in even the best of English Lutheran hymnbooks which ought not to be sung in Lutheran churches, hymns which are so far from being even distinctively Christian, that they are among the favorite hymns of such as are not Christians in any true sense of the word.

While this new Sunday-School Hymnal is not free from these traditional influences, it is far superior to everything of its kind that we had seen before. It contains a good selection of genuine Lutheran hymns in good translations. It also embodies a number of hymns not of Lutheran origin, but well worthy of a place in a Lutheran hymnbook. But

the proportion of those which are and those which are not of Lutheran parentage is not as it might be. The latter preponderate so largely that they impair the character of the book. Not only might a number of the foreign hymns have been absolutely omitted without loss to the Lutheran church, but many of those that would remain might have been profitably supplanted by Lutheran hymns already existing in fair translations. Others might have been translated for this work from Norwegian and Swedish originals, especially since these Scandinavian churches will in the near future contribute quite largely to the membership of the English Lutheran church in this country, and their children ought to be entitled to a fairly representative share of their paternal inheritance in the hymnody which should be provided for them and their progeny. The same must be said with even greater emphasis of the tunes. The dominant character of the music here introduced into the Lutheran church has not a Lutheran ring. In view of these merits and demerits of the work we would recommend it as a provisional book to be put to restricted use, until something still better shall be provided to take its place. A. G.

---

**The Choral Service Book**, *containing the authentic plain song intonations and responses for the Order of the Morning Service, the Orders of Matins and Vespers, the Litany and the Suffrages of the Common Service for the use of Evangelical Lutheran congregations with accompanying harmonies for organ. Edited by Harry G. Archer, organist, First Church, Pittsburg, Pa., and the Rev. Luther D. Reed, Pastor, Emanuel Church, Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia, General Council Publication Board.*

L, and 228 pages, bound in black cloth, stamped in gold. Price, \$1.00.

This is in various ways a beautiful book. It is not only typographically the most beautiful Lutheran church



book we have seen, but the contents also, both words and music, are exquisite in their chaste and solemn churchliness. We cannot say that we have a preference for the *Common Service*. The Order of Service set forth in our *Agenda* is, in our opinion, fully as churchly and better adapted to the wants of the average congregation, no less representative of the best Lutheran traditions, more symmetrical in its articulation, and more stately in its proportions and movement. But while the task allotted to the compilers of this book was that of setting the *Common Service* to music, they certainly have acquitted themselves most creditably. Their work may be of service not only to those who use the *Common Service*, but also to others who would acquaint themselves with truly classical liturgical music adapted to English liturgical texts. This adaptation was the chief difficulty with which the compilers had to contend and which, in several instances, led them to what we consider a mistake, that of falling back on the Roman Cationales, as the *Directorium Chori* and the *Graduale Romanum*, where they might have adhered to Lutheran models. The price of the book is remarkably low. A. G.

---

**The Greek Testament.** *A resultant text exhibiting the critical texts of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and Weiss with their various readings as well as those of the more important Greek Mss. Edited for the Bible Society of Wuerttemberg, Stuttgart, by Prof. Eberhard Nestle, Ph. D., D. D. With an introduction and appendix on the irregular verbs by Prof. R. F. Weidner, D. D., LL. D., President of Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary. Authorized edition. Fleming H. Revell Company. Chicago. 1901.*

Price, in flexible cloth, \$1.00, in leather, \$1.25.

The Greek text of the New Testament is by all means the most valuable book in a theologian's library. We do not say this in disparagement of the original text of the Old

Testament, which is as truly and in the same sense the inspired word of God as the New Testament, and teaches the same way of salvation by the same Savior of a fallen world. But as the sun and the moon are both luminaries placed in the firmament of heaven by the same almighty hand of God, and yet the one outshines the other, so the light of saving truth is more profusely and abundantly shed forth in the New Testament than in Moses and the prophets, and it is no more than proper that the theologian should refer to the apostles and evangelists ten times where he draws from the books of the Old Testament once. It is, therefore, with sincere pleasure that we hail the appearance of every new and commendable edition of the Greek New Testament. "This edition," says Dr. Weidner in his *Introduction*, "has many merits: a) It contains a critically revised text, based on a collation of the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Weiss, and Weymouth; b) it indicates in foot-notes all differences between the texts adopted by these critical editors; c) it gives also in foot-notes the readings of some important manuscripts, notably of *Codex Bezae* (in Gospels and Acts); d) it furnishes in the margin a selection of the best parallel references; e) all Old Testament quotations are printed in black type; f) it is the best working edition of all the manual editions of a critical text, especially noted for the beauty of its typography, and deserves to become every student's *vade mecum*." Owing to circumstances not under our control we have not found the time to make a thorough investigation of the print before us. But from what we have compared we do not hesitate to give it a warm recommendation. We should prefer to have the book without the 52 pages of *Appendix on irregular verbs*. The compiler says: "This Catalogue includes all verbs in use in the Greek Testament which may present difficulties to a beginner in Greek." We hold that a beginner in Greek should not use the Greek Testament as a *vade mecum*. The vernacular Bible is the proper book for him.

A. G.